

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 10 November 1981

**The SPEAKER** (Hon. B. C. Eastick) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

## ASSENT TO BILLS

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

Mining Act Amendment,  
Pipelines Authority Act Amendment,  
Stamp Duties Act Amendment.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HOUSING TRUST ACT  
AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

## PARKS COMMUNITY CENTRE BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

## PETITION: CASINO

A petition signed by 19 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Federal Government to set up a committee to study the social effects of gambling; and reject the proposals currently before the House to legalise casino gambling in South Australia and establish a Select Committee on casino operations in this State was presented by Mr Oswald.

Petition received.

## PETITIONS: PRE-SCHOOL COSTS

Petitions signed by 683 concerned residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to provide sufficient funds to cover all pre-school operating costs were presented by the Hons W. E. Chapman and M. M. Wilson and Messrs Billard, Crafter, Mathwin, and Peterson.

Petitions received.

## PETITION: INTEREST RATES

A petition signed by 3 204 residents of South Australia praying that the House request the State Government to urge the Federal Government to reduce home loan interest rates; ensure that home buyers with existing loans are not bankrupted or evicted as a result of increased interest rates; provide increased welfare housing and develop a loan programme to allow prospective home builders to obtain adequate finance was presented by Mr O'Neill.

Petition received.

## QUESTIONS

**The SPEAKER:** I direct that the written answers to questions asked both in the House and in the Estimates Committees, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos. 144, 154, 171, 198, 204, 205, 207, 210, 212 to 217, 221 to 223, 226, 227, 231, and 234.

## REMISSION FOR PRISONERS

In reply to the **Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (24 September).

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The South Australian Government has not granted general remissions for prisoners because of Royal tours. The New South Wales and Commonwealth Governments have done so in the past. The New South Wales Royal Commission into Prisons reported:

Royal Visit remissions are a relic of the past and appear anachronistic.

Under the circumstances, the South Australian Government does not propose to introduce the custom.

## DUST NUISANCE

In reply to **Mr KENEALLY** (24 September).

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** During the winter of 1980 extensive regrading and filling of land was carried out at Port Augusta and Port Pirie to cater for the demand of building sites in anticipation of the Redcliff development. To alleviate the dust nuisance galvanised iron and 'sand drift' fences were erected both at Port Augusta and Port Pirie. Cleaning operations were instituted at Port Augusta and the sites at Port Pirie were sprayed with a bituminous emulsion.

In addition to the fences erected last year the regraded areas at Port Augusta West and Port Pirie have been seeded and there is a good growth of grass especially in Port Pirie which should substantially reduce any dust problems from the areas where no building is going on.

It has been South Australian Housing Trust policy to carry out extensive regrading and filling works in these northern towns during the winter months to avoid creating dust problems on a large scale. It is impossible, however, to confine building of houses, installation of services and construction of roads to winter months alone.

The absolute necessity to continue these works with associated movement of vehicles and excavation of trenches inevitably creates some dust which cannot be controlled completely. Contractors are being instructed to minimise operations which create dust problems but there is no guarantee that they can be totally successful.

With the onset of warmer weather and the drying of the vegetation, continuing assessment is being made of the necessity of additional fencing or other preventative measures. The trust is prepared to use funds on control measures which are felt to be effective and practical.

## MUSEUM

In reply to **Mr RANDALL** (15 September).

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The History Trust of South Australia Act, 1981, states that the functions of the trust are to accumulate and care for objects of historical interest and to exhibit objects of historical or cultural interest. Chapter 12 of the Edwards Report on Museum Policy and Development in South Australia makes comprehensive recommendations for the use by the History Trust of the

Jervois Wing, currently part of the State Library, and of the historic buildings behind the Museum. These include the Jervois Wing becoming the State History Centre and housing reference collections and changing displays of South Australian history; the Armoury Building and hospital, chapel and schoolroom housing the performing arts collection; and the destitute asylum buildings housing an ethnic museum.

The State Centre for the Restoration of Cultural Property will carry out the conservation functions of the State History Trust along with those of the State Library, Art Gallery and South Australian Museum, all of which have in the past collected items of South Australian historical interest.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: SOUTH AUSTRALIAN LAND COMMISSION

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer):** I seek leave to make a short statement about the South Australian Land Commission.

**The SPEAKER:** Is leave granted?

**Mr Millhouse:** No.

**The SPEAKER:** There being a dissentient voice, leave is not granted.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable Ministers to make Ministerial statements before Question Time.

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition):** Thank you, Mr Speaker. You sat down, David.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Premier moved the motion, and has no further right of debate on the issue. The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr BANNON:** Mr Speaker—

**Mr Millhouse:** You can *ad lib*; you take the blame.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr Millhouse:** You gave that to me.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr BANNON:** I think the Government could stifle its amusement and try to behave a little more responsibly. The Opposition will support the Premier's right to make his Ministerial statement but, in so doing, I wish to make quite clear the basis on which we do that. At this stage, I would like to read into the record a letter sent to the Premier by the member for Mitcham. I think it is appropriate that it be done.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I draw to the Leader's attention that the debate we are now undertaking is in support of the reason why the suspension should apply. It restricts the degree of other debate relative to that matter which can be properly considered now.

**Mr BANNON:** This letter is precisely on the point as to whether leave should be granted, because it refers to whether or not leave should be granted, on a general basis, for Ministerial statements. I think it is very appropriate indeed in determining our attitude to this motion moved by the Government. The member for Mitcham wrote to the Premier and sent a copy to me, which I received only a short time ago, in which he said that he was writing about Ministerial statements. I quote:

I am prompted to do so by the abuse of the opportunity to make them by the Minister of Industrial Affairs on Wednesday 28 October when he read a statement nearly 11 pages long, about Brian Grove Constructions. It went for over 10 minutes, I think. Apparently this was supplementary to a question which he had answered the day before. It was a mean thing to do and cut into

Question Time which then had to be extended, thus itself reducing the time for private members' business.

The arrangement which we made, following my earlier complaints about Ministerial statements, was that leave would be given, provided copies of the statement were made available beforehand to the Labor Party, Peter Blacker, Norman Peterson and me. That arrangement has been more or less kept by the Government, although your Minister of Agriculture tried to avoid it the other day, being very properly reproved by the Speaker.

However, it was never intended that such statements should be as long as they have become (Dean Brown's is the worst example) or that they would be used (as most of them now are) so obviously merely for Party political purposes.

The Minister of Education, too, has been a particular offender in this, and just latterly has been joined by the Deputy Premier. The letter continues:

After the incident on 28 October, my patience is again exhausted. I want you to know that unless you give an undertaking, in the House tomorrow afternoon, before any attempt is made by you or your Ministers to give statements, to the effect that the original arrangement as to providing copies will be honoured and in addition Ministerial statements will be made simply to give information which could not otherwise be conveniently given to the House, not being of a Party-political nature and that such statements will take no longer than, say, three minutes to give, I propose to resist the giving of leave. Then you will have to go back to suspending Standing Orders each time the Government wants to make a Ministerial statement.

The honourable member then says that he will send copies of the letter to various other persons. That letter sets out very clearly the issue on this question of granting leave. It was in accordance with that that the member for Mitcham called against the Premier's receiving leave on this occasion. It is certainly a matter which has concerned the Opposition over a considerable period. We had thought, as had the member for Mitcham, that the Government was acceding to an agreement we had made on this matter. But, as the months have gone by, increasingly Ministerial statements have been, in effect, abusing the procedures of this House, providing insufficient opportunity for members to debate, being used by Ministers not to canvass matters of immediate information, but to canvass matters of a Party-political nature, which would far better be the subject of debate in this place.

For those reasons I was very much inclined, as were my colleagues, to support the member for Mitcham in any call against Ministerial statements. However, we must qualify that and we must view this matter responsibly. The Government does have rights to make Ministerial statements. It does have rights to put matters before the House. To call, without any indication of what the subject matter is or without any idea of what the Government is going to say, on every occasion would be an unnecessary restriction on that right of the Government, and it would waste the time of the House. The Government could find another recourse if this happened. It could simply get its Ministerial statements introduced in the form of Dorothy Dix questions from its back-benchers. Again, we have had blatant abuses of all those things.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Leader is moving a long way away from dealing with a Ministerial statement when he starts to discuss questions, whether they be natural or Dorothy Dixers.

**Mr BANNON:** I am suggesting that this is relevant because, if the Government is refused the right to make Ministerial statements, it could find other procedures of this House to do it, most particularly, the use of Question Time, and it will simply cut down opportunities honourable members on this side of the House have to question the Government. I have replied to the member for Mitcham on this matter. I think my letter adequately sums up our attitude on this. It indicates where I agree and where I disagree with the statement he has made. I have said to the honourable member:

I agree with you that the Ministerial statement by the Minister of Industrial Affairs on Wednesday 28 October was a flagrant abuse of the procedures of the Parliament. The fact that the Minister was required to seek further leave under Standing Order 136 indicates that he took up more than 15 minutes of the House's time—

not the 10 minutes suggested by the member for Mitcham—

I might add that I agree to further leave being granted following an assurance from the Premier that Question Time would be extended. As you also know, arrangements were made to extend the time for the introduction of private members' business so that you were able to speak to all the matters that you wished to raise that day.

That was particularly important, because the member for Mitcham had a number of matters that he was introducing on that day. I go on:

You will recall that when I wrote to you about this matter on 26 August last year, I said that I doubted whether refusing leave would solve the problem. It is always possible for a Minister to get around the refusal of leave by arranging for a back-bencher to ask a Dorothy Dixier which will allow him to cover the subject matter of his statement and would be worse than the present situation in that it would take up valuable Question Time. A Ministerial statement should only give information which could not otherwise be conveniently given to the House, and they should not be used for political purposes, however I do not agree that a set time limit should apply.

I interpose at this point to say that the member for Mitcham would seek to limit to about three minutes the time given for such statements. I do not think it is appropriate to put such a limitation on it, particularly bearing in mind that the Government is prepared to extend the length of Question Time in cases where Ministerial statements unreasonably cut into it. Finally, I said:

In the final event the Government has to take the consequences for its abuse of Parliament and I think recent press articles indicate that they are in fact being condemned for their actions.

For those reasons the Opposition is not prepared to call against or vote against the granting of leave, but we certainly agree with the substance of the honourable member's complaints, and support him in those complaints, as we have done in the past.

**The SPEAKER:** The question before the Chair is that the motion be agreed to. Those of that opinion say 'Aye', against 'No'.

**Mr Millhouse:** No.

**The SPEAKER:** There being a dissentient voice, and there being present an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House, a division is necessary. Ring the bells.

*While the division was being held:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There being only one member on the side of the Noes, I declare that the Ayes have it.

Motion carried.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Members would be aware that the South Australian Land Commission was established in 1973 by the previous Governments of both the Commonwealth and of this State. The purpose of the commission was to acquire, manage and develop land for present and future urban expansion with the primary objective of providing land to persons who are without large financial resources.

Apart from some small grants, the commission's activities have been financed by repayable loans from both the Commonwealth Government and the South Australian Government. Loans provided by the Commonwealth amount to \$53 000 000 and by the State \$11 000 000, of which \$8 000 000 has been provided by borrowings from various financial institutions. As at 30 June 1981, the debt to the Commonwealth, including capitalised interest, amounted to almost \$89 000 000.

If existing arrangements continued, the debt to the Commonwealth would be \$122 000 000 by the time the first

repayments were due to be made in 1984. As you know, Sir, my Government was not prepared to have the taxpayers of this State meet that escalating cost. Detailed negotiations have taken place between our officers and officers of the Commonwealth with a view to reaching some suitable arrangement on this matter. I am pleased to say that negotiations have now been concluded and that, following my meeting with the Prime Minister at the weekend, the Commonwealth Government has agreed to waive its debt of \$89 000 000 (as it now stands) for a lump sum payment of \$36 000 000.

Arrangements have been made for that payment to be made as follows: \$25 000 000 in 1981-82; \$5 500 000 in 1982-83; and \$5 500 000 in 1983-84. This represents a considerable achievement for South Australia. We have liquidated a debt of \$89 000 000 for \$36 000 000. We retain full control of the assets of the commission and the benefits which will flow in future years from those assets. We can now proceed with the implementation of the South Australian Urban Land Trust and provide it with a financial structure which should enable it to operate on a proper commercial basis.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: DOW CHEMICAL COMPANY

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Minister of Mines and Energy):** I seek leave to make a short statement.

**The SPEAKER:** Leave is not required because the motion passed by the House was for Ministerial statements before Question Time.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I refer to the decision by Dow Chemical Company to concentrate its further studies in relation to a petro-chemical project in the Stony Point area. This decision was communicated to the Government on 29 October and followed a detailed comparative analysis that Dow had made of the Stony Point and Redcliff sites. In communicating its decision, Dow also requested the Government not to make any announcement until approval had been given to the environmental impact statement prepared by the Cooper Basin Producers on their proposals for development at Stony Point.

The Government accepted the merits of this approach in that it would allow Dow's position to be further considered in the context of any decisions which the Government may make on the environmental impact statement of the Cooper Basin Producers. I understand that Dow's request for confidentiality was also indicated to the Leader of the Opposition when the company briefed him on 29 October. It is to be regretted, therefore, that the Leader of the Opposition has chosen to break confidence on this matter. In the *Advertiser* this morning, the Leader gave as his reason for this action an announcement he claimed Dow had already made in Port Augusta. I am informed that, in fact, Dow made no public announcement in Port Augusta and that the company had been proceeding on the basis that no announcement would be made until the completion of the Cooper Basin Producers environmental impact statement.

#### PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister of Education (Hon. H. Allison)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

Adelaide College of the Arts and Education—Report, 1980.  
Children's Court Advisory Committee—Report, 1980-81.  
Further Education, Department of—Report, 1980.  
Legal Services Commission of South Australia—Report, 1980-81.

Supreme Court Act, 1935-1981—Rules of Court—Supreme Court—Costs.

Flinders University of South Australia—Report and University Legislation, 1980.

By the Chief Secretary (Hon. W. A. Rodda)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

Fire Brigades Board—Report, 1980-81.

By the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. W. E. Chapman)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

Dried Fruits Board of South Australia—Report for year ending 28 February 1981.

By the Minister of Environment and Planning (Hon. D. C. Wotton)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

Beverage Container Act, 1975-1976—Regulations—Mineral Water Bottles.

Tea Tree Gully (Golden Grove) Development Act, 1978-1981—Regulations—

Development Applications.

Subdividing and Roads.

City of Whyalla—By-law No. 32—Keeping of Dogs.

District Council of Barmera—By-law No. 32—Itinerant Traders.

District Council of Clare—By-law No. 26—Christison Park.

By the Minister of Transport (Hon. M. M. Wilson)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

Road Traffic Act, 1961-1981—Regulations—

Traffic Prohibition—Robe.

Traffic Prohibition—Woodville.

By the Minister of Recreation and Sport (Hon. M. M. Wilson)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

Racing Act, 1976-1978—Rules of Trotting—Driving, Branding and Leasing.

By the Minister of Health (Hon. Jennifer Adamson)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

South Australian Health Commission Act, 1975-1980—By-laws—Lyell McEwin Hospital—Control of Grounds.

Charitable Funds, Commissioners of—Report, 1980-81.

Community Welfare, Department for—Report, 1980-81.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: MEAT INSPECTORS STRIKE

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN (Minister of Agriculture):** I seek leave to make a statement.

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable Minister will proceed under the suspension of Standing Orders.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** Thank you, Sir. Members will be well aware that Commonwealth meat inspectors have been on strike since midnight last Wednesday, 4-5 November. While the effect of this action has resulted in dislocation of the export meat trade throughout the Commonwealth, the impact has been particularly severe in South Australia which, as the champion of a unified meat inspection service, has been using Commonwealth inspectors for local trade inspection since 1965.

Although our peculiar circumstances have been brought to the attention of the Commonwealth Meat Inspectors Association and of their employers, the Commonwealth Department of Primary Industry, it has not been possible to negotiate a settlement which will allow for special consideration of South Australia's case, that is, to allow domestic market slaughter to occur. Most meat processors in this State took appropriate action upon receipt of the notice given that strike action would occur and emptied their lairages and holding yards of livestock before the strike commenced. Others less fortunate find themselves now with livestock on hand which, they claim, are dying because of lack of inspectorial service.

Accordingly, I have authorised senior veterinary officers of my department to make on-the-spot assessments of the animals at risk in the small number of abattoirs involved, to recommend appropriate humane measures to the abattoir operators concerned. This strike has, however, placed the State's meat industry in serious commercial jeopardy. I therefore give notice to the House, to the Commonwealth Meat Inspectors Association, and to the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry that the present disruption of this State's supply of inspected meat and disease trace-back service has forced this Government to review its championship of a single inspection service; indeed, my officers are at this moment examining the feasibility of introducing an appropriate emergency service. We believe that the provision of such a service would help to protect producers, processors and consumers of meat from similar disruptions in the future. I will keep the Parliament progressively informed of the developments.

## QUESTION TIME

### PAY-ROLL TAX

**Mr BANNON:** Will the Premier as a matter of priority amend the Pay-roll Tax Act to bring the general exemption from the tax into line with the Victorian exemption, thereby providing urgently needed relief for thousands of small businesses in this State? From 1 January next, the Victorian general pay-roll tax exemption will be raised to \$125 000 from \$96 600. However, the South Australian exemption will be frozen at last year's level of \$84 000 by this Government, which claims to be backing small business. (In New South Wales the exemption level is \$120 000.) Under the Dunstan and Corcoran Governments, the pay-roll tax exemption was pegged at the Victorian level, to keep local business competitive. From January, South Australian firms with pay-rolls in the range \$84 000 to \$250 000 will be at a disadvantage compared with their interstate competitors. This would involve 2 000 to 3 000 small businesses in South Australia in this pay-roll range, with tens of thousands of employees. A firm in South Australia with a pay-roll of \$200 000 will pay 29.8 per cent more tax next year than will a similar firm in Victoria. The Opposition has contacted small business organisations about the matter, and I report a selection of their comments. The Master Hairdressers' Association of South Australia said, 'We hope your efforts in making a stand against pay-roll tax for small business are fruitful.' The Federation of Travel Agents has circularised the Opposition's letter to about 100 members, because the federation 'was very interested in the matter'.

The National Hardware Institute of South Australia Committee discussed the matter at length and indicated that the Opposition's letter will be brought to the attention of all members of the hardware industry within the State in the next newsletter. The Chamber of Commerce and Industry, in its *Journal of Industry*, also commented:

One omission from the pay-roll tax treatment in the Budget was the failure to raise the limit from \$84 000 in line with growth in wages over the past 18 months. In fact, the limit, to be equitable and not to place an additional burden on employment in South Australia, should have been raised to around \$100 000 to keep it in line with other States. The private sector would like to see this omission rectified without delay.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I have been trying to find the reference in *Hansard* to the proceedings before Estimates Committee A, where the Leader raised this matter and where I gave him an undertaking, and an assurance, that the matter was being reviewed and would be reviewed before the end of the year. It is typical of the misrepresentation in which the Leader is constantly indulging in the

community that he chose to write letters as he did and ignored the assurance given to him very properly in this Chamber and recorded in this Chamber.

Let me get a few things quite straight. This is absolutely typical of the doom and gloom that the Opposition is spreading in this community at present; not only that, but it is another example of the dishonest misrepresentation currently becoming the practice of the Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition has said in his letters (and I have heard him say publicly) that the level of pay-roll tax exemption will be frozen in South Australia. He knows perfectly well that the level of pay-roll tax exemption is not changed until 1 January. I have already told him in this House that the Government will be looking at that entire question closer to the time when the change must be made but that, if it can be done, we will make the maximum possible increase in the exemption.

*Mr Bannon interjecting:*

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The Leader says that it is a stunt. I would suggest that his whole concocted campaign, putting unnecessary fears and concern into the minds of small business men, is much more of a stunt, and a totally dishonest one, too. I repeat: the Leader has deliberately ignored the question that he asked in Estimates Committee A; he has deliberately ignored the answer that was given; and he has deliberately misrepresented the true position. I have very little respect indeed for either him or his Party for the tactics they have used.

**Mr Millhouse:** In other words, you say he is a thorough scoundrel, do you?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The member for Mitcham has used the words; I have not.

**Mr Millhouse:** But that is what you are saying.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Well, I think the people of South Australia are beginning to judge for themselves. I point out to the Leader of the Opposition, as I did earlier, that both the Victorian and New South Wales Governments have put a surcharge of 1 per cent on pay-roll tax, and effectively many thousands of workers are being paid for at the rate of 6 per cent, and not 5 per cent.

The South Australian Government will be considering what move can be made in relation to the exemption, and that decision will be made close to the time when this House gets up for the Christmas recess. I remind the Leader that the House will be sitting well into December. The decision will be taken and the House will hear about it in good time. Having told the Leader of the Opposition that fact, I believe that his behaviour in ignoring the answer he has already been given in this Chamber is quite disgraceful.

### STATE ECONOMY

**Mr EVANS:** Is the Premier aware of an article in the British journal, the *Economist*, which states that South Australia will not benefit, as other States will, from resource development? If so, will he explain to the House the Government's position on this subject?

**Mr Millhouse:** I think that article may be right.

**Mr Mathwin:** Did you write it, Robin?

**Mr Millhouse:** If I had written it—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Mitcham will remain silent.

**Mr EVANS:** The Opposition Leader has been quoted as saying that the Premier should take notice of the article in the *Economist*, which was critical of the economic position in South Australia. I also understand from press reports that the *Economist* said that other States would reap greater benefits from resource development than would

South Australia, because of their coal deposits. An explanation by the Premier is important in relation to this State's position.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I did hear reference to the Opposition Leader's remarks in support of the *Economist* article. The reaction we have seen from the Opposition just in the last two or three minutes demonstrates quite clearly how pleased it seems to be about it. First, the author of that article in the *Economist* did not bother to contact my office, or any other relevant Government department, for information. No-one approached the Agent-General in London. Indeed, I can find no suggestion at all that any trouble was taken to find out exactly South Australia's position. Therefore, it can only be assumed that the information used by the *Economist* in that article was gleaned from interstate business sources, which, as I believe is well known, have a jaundiced view of what is happening in this State. That view is shared in this State only by members of the Opposition, apparently.

I was very concerned that the Opposition generally seemed to seize upon that article in the *Economist* with a great deal of pleasure, delight and glee. Indeed, Opposition members took pleasure and relished the opportunity to denigrate and criticise this State and its future. I do not know why they are so ashamed of South Australia, or why they try to run it down and make it sound as bad as they possibly can. The way in which they distribute and disseminate doom and gloom absolutely appals me.

To balance the picture, it would be better if I were to quote from two Australian newspapers of some authority and standing, which basically give the other side (I think the appropriate one) of the picture. The first quote is from the *Australian*, which, in a recent feature on energy, states:

When it comes to the resource stakes, Western Australia, New South Wales and Queensland may run hardest and shout loudest, but South Australia is the most underrated of the energy and resource orientated States.

The *Financial Review* of 5 November states:

Western Mining discovery of the Stuart Shelf mineral province is probably still the best example of a discovery originating from a conceptual approach. The full story of the techniques used and the clues gathered along the way has still to unfold.

The report continues:

The Roxby Downs deposit, the end result and the Stuart Shelf, is now probably the most active single exploration property in Australia with a \$100 000 000 of exploration committed by B.P. Roxby Downs, a deposit 18 square kilometres in area, is only one of a number of prospects in the region. Indications of similar mineralisation have been found at Acropolis, and B.P. has the pick of 10 other targets outside of Roxby Downs. The area has been likened to the Zambian copperbelt, one of the world's major sources of copper supply and, although such comparison may be speculative, it is certainly a resource that will increase the influence of Australian copper production in world markets.

Those comments are from two newspapers which understand the Australian mineral situation and, I suggest, understand it far better than does the London-based *Economist*.

*Mr Millhouse interjecting:*

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The important thing is that it is so typical of the Opposition to adopt a destructive and negative approach, an approach which, as I now find quite fascinating, is being echoed by the member for Mitcham. The attitude of doom and gloom being propagated by the Opposition is becoming a standing joke among investors in the business world in South Australia and in Australia. I always like to give credit where credit is due, and I am prepared to give the Leader of the Opposition credit for one sensible statement he made about a week ago; it was the one piece of optimism that somehow managed to break through the Opposition's clouds of gloom. I was so surprised when I heard it on an A.B.C. interview that I immediately

checked to make sure I had not misheard it, and that it was correct. The Leader said:

What has happened in South Australia is we have oversold in the last couple of years. We have said things are better than they are, instead of being realistic and hard-headed about it. This is all we need.

But then he went on to say:

I mean, basically the economy is in very sound shape.

I totally agree with him in that instance. I find it remarkable that it should have taken him all this long time to finally come to the correct view. He goes on afterwards to say:

But we are not helped by chasing after long-term projects well into the future as the present Government is doing.

What does he suggest we should do to secure the future of South Australia for all South Australians? Does he suggest that we should just sit here and do nothing? I think he referred to cottage industries, and weaving and pottery, or something of that nature. He was echoing an earlier Leader. But the Leader is correct: the economy is in very good shape. However, to say that the Government is wasting its time in pursuing a project described as a duplication of something of the magnitude of the Zambian copper belt indicates a fundamental lack of understanding of what resource development is all about. I can only say that, if by any very sad chance the Opposition ever came to Government in this State, the Government would be sitting, not looking at forward planning, and not looking at any of the projects for development which basically are going to rescue our economy and put us all on the road to prosperity. It would be sitting there, and South Australia would be sold down the drain. I am glad that the Leader of the Opposition and the members of his Party have put their attitude, their contempt for resource development, on clear public record at this time while there is still plenty of time for the people of South Australia to see what is in store under a Liberal Government.

### ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** Is the Premier concerned that statements made by Mr R. D. H. Ling, in his presidential address to the Metal Industries Association of South Australia, raise real doubts about the impact of economic development policies of the Tonkin Government? If he is not concerned, why is he not concerned? In his address, Mr Ling said:

The importance of the metal industries as a source of employment prospects for South Australians has been recognised by the State Government and I commend them for their efforts to provide a stable environment conducive to the operation of manufacturing industry, but this in itself is not enough. A firm grasp of the importance of manufacturing industry assumes even greater importance when it is realised that resource-based developments, though valuable to the future of this State and Australia, do not provide many jobs.

Mr Ling, a respected business man, and one whom the Premier, I am sure, could not describe as a knocker, also reported the findings of the 1981 national survey of metal industry companies, which revealed that South Australia was the only State in which there was a reduction in numbers employed; that is, 1.8 per cent. Possibly the survey findings include the loss of 350 jobs at the Whyalla steelworks this year, a fact announced by B.H.P. in the *Whyalla News*, but about which the Premier or the Minister of Industrial Affairs—I will not cheapen the proceedings by calling them Mr Huff and Mr Puff—have been silent.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** Also, Mr Ling referred to South Australia's having the lowest population growth of

any State and there being a climate in which water charges have risen by 33½ per cent and in which average electricity tariffs have increased by 32 per cent since June last year. Mr Ling warned that State charges, particularly charges for water and energy, should be kept down to help keep industry competitive with other States.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I am not quite sure what the Deputy Leader is talking about when he says that Mr Ling is a knocker or not a knocker, because almost everything that he has read out today shows a great commendation of the Government. I expect that I know Mr Ling better than the Deputy Premier does. May I go through the points with which the Deputy Leader has come forward?

**Mr Millhouse:** But David, what you just said does not seem to add up.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr Millhouse:** It doesn't add up, Mr Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Mr Ling has been very complimentary indeed. I refer first to Hills Industries and to its annual report for this year, which I commend to the Deputy Leader.

**Mr Bannon:** I was at their A.G.M. I did not see you there.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I am talking about the annual report—

*Mr Bannon interjecting:*

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I am very pleased that the Leader of the Opposition was there—full marks. I do hope he wins a vote.

*Mr Bannon interjecting:*

**The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy:** What do you want—a medal?

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** I just want my question answered.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I would suggest that the Deputy Leader, the alternative Leader, if the member for Elizabeth is not taken into account, might speak to his Leader and ask him whether he would shut up.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr Trainer:** You pompous ass!

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I would not have called the Deputy Leader a pompous ass. Other people have done so. However, if that is the view of the member for Ascot Park, far be it from me to disagree.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The House will come back to order.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Mr Ling has been most complimentary to the Government, and I would like to return the compliment by saying that I believe that Hills Industries has done remarkably well during the past 12 months. Indeed, I agree with Mr Ling, in his comments to me, that things have not been this good for many years. He has commended the Government for its efforts; he has promised that he will do everything that he can to communicate his concerns to the Government as they arise, which is very right and proper. Mr Ling commended the Government for not putting on the 1 per cent surcharge that was put on in other States of New South Wales and Victoria in respect of pay-roll tax; he was most complimentary about that. This, I think, is something that the Deputy Leader has chosen to ignore.

Mr Ling is quite correct also in saying that resource development is not enough. It does not create the number of direct jobs that some direct industries do, but nevertheless it creates a considerable number of jobs. If the Deputy Leader has any other suggestions about any other industry which might create more jobs or which has a better potential future for South Australia than does our mining

resource development programme, I suggest that it is about time that he got up and spoke about it. However, I am sure that he does not have any such suggestion to make.

We are going to get on with the development of our resources, whether they be in the Cooper Basin, the Officer Basin, Roxby Downs, Olympic Dam, or any other area of this State, because, unless we do that, we will not create any jobs at all in the immediate future, and the Deputy Leader knows that full well. Do I have to remind him yet again that during the two years before the last election employment in this State dropped by over 20 000. Do I have to remind him that since we came to office that trend has been reversed entirely and that the latest figures available show there are now 19 000 more jobs in South Australia in the private sector.

**Mr McRae:** No, he won't wear that.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** These are clear irrefutable figures. I am surprised that the Deputy Leader raises these matters again and draws the attention of the community to them, because they show quite conclusively that the Labor Administration, up to 1979, was absolutely disastrous for South Australia. I turn, finally, to the comment that I made in this place one or two weeks ago. Apparently the Deputy Leader also takes some small comfort from the fact that members of the private sector and of the business community are prepared to express their concerns and worries to the Government in direct terms. May I say that that is the way that this Government wants it, and I sincerely hope that matters stay that way, because it indicates a very close degree of support for the Government of the day. If those people did not support this Government, they would not take the trouble to let us know exactly what their concerns are.

Frequently we are able to help in the matters that those people bring forward. If the Deputy Leader thinks for a moment that he is going to get any support for his anti-business policies, his 35-hour week and his six-months notice before severance and redundancy arrangements are made, and, if he thinks he is going to get implemented his Party's policies of allowing trade unions to examine all of the detailed books of every private company in South Australia, I can only say that he is deluding himself and has another think coming. There is no way that the business community will give him any support at all. I suggest that the Deputy Leader would be a lot better off if, instead of trying to score cheap political points and trying to drag reputable business leaders into this miserable business that he is undertaking, he found out the facts about our resource potential and did everything he could to ensure that it went ahead.

#### MANAGEMENT STAFF

**Mr OLSEN:** Will the Minister of Environment and Planning say what are the criteria for the appointment of senior managers in the Department of Environment and Planning, and specifically in relation to the appointment of a new Director of the National Parks and Wildlife Service? I refer to an article which appeared in today's press headed 'Public Service Hiring Slam' and in which certain allegations are made by the Opposition that the Government is generally downgrading the Department of Environment and Planning by employing managers who do not have professional environmental backgrounds.

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** I thank the honourable member for his question. That report is just another example of what can be described as the negative attitude of Opposition members. We are becoming quite accustomed to that attitude, and we have seen it again in that report in today's

press. I say at the outset that any suggestion that there is no need for the Department of Environment and Planning to be headed by senior executives possessing strong administrative skills is quite erroneous. I would have thought that anyone in this House would recognise that. To suggest that such a substantial Public Service department does not need a strong executive team experienced in management shows how poorly equipped and how out of touch the Opposition is in coming to grips with the task of modern public administration. We see this time and time again.

The Department of Environment and Planning is technically complex, and I should have thought that the Opposition would recognise that. It is diverse in its responsibilities. It spends about \$25 000 000 in taxpayers' funds annually and employs a work force of about 700 people possessing diverse professions and skills. I suggest that there is probably no other Public Service organisation of such diversity and complexity. Throughout the department there are specialists, environmental scientists, biologists, botanists, historians, planners, economists, architects, engineers, and so we could go on.

Public administration in a department such as the Environment and Planning Department involves far more than a pursuit of a simple speciality. It requires the bringing together of advice from many sources and formulating from that advice coherent innovative policies. That is what the proper administration of any Government department should be about. It is all very well for the Opposition to have made these statements and take the matter fairly lightly, but to suggest that the selection of staff in the department at senior management levels is quite short-sighted does nothing but denigrate a dedicated group of men and women, who as public servants ensure that in the administration of the Government's environmental policies the highest professional standards are maintained. If that is not what Opposition members want, I can assure them that that is what the Government of South Australia is looking for.

I would have thought that the formation of the new Department of Environment and Planning reflects the important part that environmental factors play in this Government's decision-making. Its choice of senior managers needs to reflect the requirement for management skills in order to organise the work programmes undertaken in every area. As I said earlier, the matter raised is another example of the negative attitude of the Opposition on issues such as this.

**The SPEAKER:** The Chair is advised that any further questions directed to the Premier will be taken by the Deputy Premier.

#### WATER RESOURCES

**Mr MAX BROWN:** Has the Minister of Health taken note of the Coroner's report on the death of a young boy in Whyalla last summer from amoebic meningitis, and if she has will she pursue with her colleague the Minister of Water Resources the urgency of proper water filtration and chlorination of the northern water supply and give further assurances and guarantees in regard to 1981-82 of not reducing the amoebic meningitis monitoring programme? I believe the Coroner's report showed that the boy contracted amoebic meningitis while swimming last summer at a public swimming pool in Whyalla in water originating from the public water supply. I point out to the Minister that it is absolutely vital that the northern cities be given proper and real assurances that such a tragic incident will never occur again.



**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** I have not seen the Coroner's report but I will make sure that I do see that report. But to take note of the other comments made in the honourable member's explanation, the Government has acted to do all that can possibly be done to ensure that within the limits of our capabilities there is no repetition. As I have stressed time and time again, the disease of amoebic meningitis is endemic in this State, and there is no way that any Government, no matter what action it took, could entirely eliminate the risk. Our job is to reduce the risk to the absolute minimum, and we have acted to ensure that that occurs.

The chlorination levels are being closely monitored. The number of staff in the State water laboratory that monitors the sumping used to be two; it has been boosted to four, and an additional officer will shortly be appointed. The Government's plans for filtration in the northern towns are well known to the House and have been detailed to the House by the Minister of Water Resources.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The Opposition was in Government in 1976, and I am not aware that it did very much in regard to the northern filtration plant, so I do not think that what happened in 1976 is relevant to the issue. This Government has indicated that it places a high priority on the northern towns water filtration plant, and it has already in this year's Budget allocated \$3 000 000 for the development of a conceptual design for the two filtration plants to service those towns.

I will ensure that the Coroner's report is studied by health authorities. The honourable member may be interested to know that this month in each of the northern towns an education programme is being launched based on a swim in clean water and general water safety approach, which will embrace the importance of ensuring that the risk of amoebic meningitis is reduced to the absolute minimum. It will not concentrate solely on that, because we believe that the whole issue of water safety in the northern towns and throughout the State is broader than that. I repeat that we are doing our best to ensure that the risk is reduced to the minimum, whilst we recognise that the risk can never be eliminated entirely.

### MEAT INSPECTORS' STRIKE

**Mr ASHENDEN:** When does the Minister of Agriculture believe that the D.P.I. strike is likely to be resolved? Earlier today the Minister explained in a statement that the Government had prepared alternative plans for meat inspection arrangements at the State level should the D.P.I. strike continue.

I have been approached by two constituents who are each proprietors of separate wholesale meat processing firms that are suffering severe financial hardship as a result of the actions of the D.P.I. strikers, particularly as the present strike follows so closely on action taken by slaughtermen. I am advised that, if a resolution is not arrived at soon, both the businesses could well be forced to cease trading, resulting in a loss of a considerable number of jobs.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** I have reason to believe that the Department of Primary Industry inspectors will be back on the job throughout Australia tomorrow morning. I received that information a short time ago, and, although it has not been confirmed by the Minister for Primary Industry, it would appear to be reliable. I therefore do not know the circumstances that have caused this group to go back after the adamant stand taken by its association last evening at Trades Hall and at centres where its representatives met at various cities around Australia.

I do know, however, that every effort was made to negotiate with these people over a period when we have seen our own industry people being devastated by the actions taken by that inspectorial group. I am aware, as indicated by the honourable member, that particularly small industry operators have suffered dramatic financial losses and that the stock on hand have suffered like deterioration in condition; accordingly, condition losses in stock mean losses in dollars.

I am further aware that, as statements are made on behalf of this Government, both in the form of approaches to the Department of Primary Industry, to the P.S.A. and to the Municipal Officers Association, and so on, within this State, we have kept the Department of Primary Industry Inspectors Association well informed. I am aware of the concern that has developed within their own ranks within the past 24 hours particularly, and I especially mention that, because in the period during which they have been striking there has been a reaction, which it is only natural to expect, from industry, from primary industry, secondary industry, meat industry employees, and from all other parties associated with the process. Also, communication has been received from qualified meat inspectors who are not part of the Department of Primary Industry association, and there are plenty of them. One remark made to me last evening was that they were two bob a dozen. In fact, I found this morning that 125 such qualified people are on the recorded waiting list for a job with the Department of Primary Industry. A further number of these people qualified in the meat inspection field are not associated with the P.S.A. or the Municipal Officers Association and, accordingly, are quite divorced from the control of those respective authorities. With that sort of information gradually filtering back to the Primary Industry Association, I can quite appreciate their turnabout. That would appear to have been a significant factor in leading to their decision to return to work.

In Australia, and indeed in South Australia, we are not faced with a situation of having no alternative. Being aware of that alternative, the State Government set out to prepare itself for an indefinite strike period should it occur, and also to prepare a plan, as I explained in my Ministerial statement earlier today, for instances of this kind that may occur in the future, wherein we have a fall-back position and we do not place industry generally or the constituents of the honourable member for Todd in that financially disastrous position in which they have been put by this dictating group. In this State or indeed this country we cannot tolerate situations where we are dictated to and held to ransom by key personnel in major industry enterprises.

I am pleased to report, in conclusion, that the Minister for Primary Industry, with the full support of his Cabinet yesterday at Federal Government level, took that stand. Indeed, I am aware of the negotiations, the arrangements under Commissioner Taylor at discussion level that were organised by the Federal Government since the strike commenced last Wednesday, on Thursday, Friday and again at 10.30 a.m. yesterday, all without result, all unable to resolve the issue, and then ultimately yesterday afternoon, when the Minister for Primary Industry declared his Government's stand: there would be no further discussions with these people at any level unless they went back to work. On that undertaking, that they return to work, these people were assured of an arbitration hearing forthwith. Threats or no threats, as my information indicated a short while ago, they will return to work, and I have outlined the reasons why they should.



### SWIMMING INSTRUCTION

**Mr SLATER:** Will the Minister of Education say whether any further reductions in staff levels are likely to occur in the Physical Education Branch of the Education Department? The Minister will recall that recently I asked a question regarding proposed reductions in personnel associated with the school swimming classes and the effect that the reductions might have on swimming classes throughout the State. The Minister has been kind enough to confirm by letter that there will be some reductions in staff. His letter states:

As I mentioned in the House on 27 October, the level of swimming instruction will remain the same as the last two years, and similar opportunities will be provided for all children in both term-time and vacation swimming classes. There will be a reduction however in the number of seconded teachers at the Physical Education Branch from 4.5 to 2.

So, the Minister has confirmed that there will be a reduction in staff. Despite the assurances given that swimming classes will not be affected, the South Australian Swimming Instructors Association is still concerned that the classes may be affected throughout South Australia. In this regard the *News* of 4 December 1980 reported as follows:

No further reductions would be made in staffing levels in the Education Department's Physical Education Branch, the Education Minister, Mr Allison, said.

I therefore ask whether, despite the assurances given by the Minister in the press and to me by letter, there will be any further reductions in staff levels in the Physical Education Branch of the Education Department.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The contents of the letter which I sent to the honourable member and which he has kindly read to the House would still stand. I would simply say that I have received assurances on several occasions from the department's senior administrative officers that, in response to my initial instruction that the services to students should not be adversely affected during the learn-to-swim campaign, those instructions will be adhered to.

In view of the member's obvious concern, and the information that he has obtained from alternative sources, I discussed this issue again today with the Director-General of Education. I assure members of the House that we will very carefully monitor the work load of the administrative staff within the Physical Education Branch of the Education Department with a view to ensuring that those learn-to-swim campaign services are not impaired during the coming school holidays and onwards.

### PRE-SCHOOL STAFFING

**Dr BILLARD:** Can the Minister of Education indicate whether there will be any changes in staffing levels in kindergartens and pre-schools next year? During the Budget debate in this House there was some suggestion that staffing levels in kindergartens would change in the coming year. I note that at that time those allegations were denied. However, since then information has continued to come to me from kindergartens in my electorate. Very recently one kindergarten indicated that it had been informed by the Director of Personnel at the Kindergarten Union that there would be changes in staffing levels in the coming year. In view of the Minister's previous statements, and the statements that are still being made to kindergartens, I seek some assurances.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** I thank the honourable member for his question. I believe that the source of this concern within the Childhood Services teaching staff lies in the existence of a discussion document which is being circulated at Childhood Services Council level and which considers a

number of options for staffing some time in the future. I assure the House that that document has not been presented to the Minister for consideration, and that the Government firmly believes that the present staffing ratio of one to 10 should remain in the 1982 school year.

### PRE-SCHOOL FUNDING

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD:** I ask the Minister of Health, as one of the Ministers who has a connection with the Childhood Services Council, whether she will give an undertaking to this House that she is not attempting to pre-empt the findings of the inquiry established by the Minister of Education on 27 October. On that day the Minister announced to this House in a Ministerial statement that an inquiry into present funding and administration of pre-school education was under way. It was clear from the Minister's statement that the functions of the Childhood Services Council would be reviewed. However, the Minister stated that his statement was not 'intended to prejudge the findings of the inquiry'.

The *Burnside News Review* of 4 November carried an article entitled, 'Kindies want child council abolished, says Adamson' in which the Minister of Health is reported to have relayed, without any statements of a contrary nature, comments such as the following:

... if we are really serious about Government economies, perhaps we ought to think of eliminating unnecessary bodies such as the Childhood Services Council.

She is furthermore reported as giving an undertaking that she would be making strong representations to the Government to convey the views of kindergartens about the Childhood Services Council, and she believed that the present difficulties could be resolved. At no point in the press report is the Minister reported as indicating that there might be another side to the story. The absence of such comments strongly indicates that the Minister is in fact prejudging the findings of the inquiry—

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The honourable member is selectively quoting from an article. He has omitted—

**Mr Lynn Arnold:** Have you read the full article?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** Yes, I have. He has omitted to inform the House that I was quoting verbatim from a letter sent to me by a kindergarten in my electorate of Coles. I was not expressing my own view. Without the article in front of me, I could not say positively whether that was made clear in it. I gave that kindergarten and other kindergartens the undertaking that I would convey their views to the Government which, of course, I have done in the way that it is perfectly proper for a member of Parliament to do.

### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: ZEIDLER INQUIRY

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Minister of Mines and Energy):** I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** In tabling, as I now do, the Report of the Committee of Inquiry into Electricity Generation and the Sharing of Power Resources in South-East Australia, or the Zeidler Inquiry, as it has more popularly become known, I wish to draw the attention of the House to several aspects of its findings. First, while the committee reports that there is no financial justification for

the establishment of a strongly integrated grid in the 1980s, it recommends development of an appropriate basis for the establishment of a limited extension of the existing New South Wales/Victoria interconnected system to South Australia. The committee describes this proposal as follows:

The use of a (lower capacity) interconnection, essentially for exchanges of energy on an opportunity basis, would not require the construction of new power station capacity other than that needed to meet internal State requirements. The interconnection would, however, permit the installed plant in each of the systems to be utilised more efficiently and would permit optimisation of resource usage consistent with operational and financial constraints.

The committee goes on to say:

A lower capacity interconnection of appropriate size might be established between Victoria and South Australia at an estimated capital cost, depending on the type of interconnection, of \$190 000 000 or \$250 000 000, including consequential works necessary to maintain the existing capacity of the New South Wales/Victoria interconnection.

The lower cost alternative for the required transmission capacity is based on \$100 000 000 for two 275 kV transmission circuits from Portland in Victoria to Monbulla near Mount Gambier in South Australia and a 275 kV transmission circuit from Monbulla to Adelaide. The latter transmission circuit would operate in parallel with a 275 kV transmission circuit that the Electricity Trust of South Australia plans to construct between Adelaide and the Monbulla area. This transmission scheme would provide a transfer capacity of 500 MW to South Australia but, due to stability limitations, a transfer capacity of 300 MW from South Australia to Victoria. The higher cost alternative using a back-to-back direct current link at Monbulla would provide a transfer capacity of 500 MW in both directions.

The committee comments that, although the capital cost of the interconnection plus consequential works is \$190 000 000 or \$250 000 000, this could be offset by a saving of \$150 000 000 in capital expenditure on power station plant and an estimated \$50 000 000 saving due to the sharing of reserve generating plant. The committee also discusses a 250 MW link in the following terms:

Although the lower capacity (500 MW) interconnection chosen for this investigation was sized on the basis of utilising the potential benefits of opportunity energy transfers, it would also be possible to consider an even lower (250 MW) capacity link at a lower cost. The benefits would be reduced, but overall financial advantage might be possible without any change in the type of generating plant planned for South Australia. This possibility is discussed by the independent consultants in their report and could form an initial stage of the lower capacity interconnection examined in this report. However, the committee considers that the preferred initial stage of lower capacity interconnection would depend on more detailed study of the technical and financial aspects of this interconnection.

With regard to the higher capacity link, which, as I mentioned earlier, the committee does not regard as justified at present, the committee recommends that this possibility be kept under review.

In considering the committee's findings it is important to note that by opportunity exchanges it means 'transfers of surplus energy when available and of financial benefit to parties concerned'. The report also states:

Negotiation of an acceptable basis for the sharing of costs and benefits that would result from an interconnection would be a necessary precursor of any decision to extend the existing New South Wales/Victoria interconnected system to South Australia and/or Tasmania.

The Government welcomes the recommendations of the committee, and I look forward to discussing them with ETSA at the earliest opportunity. The committee also points out, with regard to energy resources for South Australia, that the possibility which appears to offer the best prospects at reasonable costs is a reallocation of natural gas reserves currently related to longer term use in New South Wales with a consequent agreement on allocation of future discoveries. This matter has been actively pursued by the Government and we will continue our endeavours in this regard.

In addition to Sir David Zeidler, the committee comprised representatives of the Commonwealth and the electricity supply authorities of New South Wales, Victoria, Tasmania, and South Australia. ETSA's representative was Mr E. J. Symons, Manager of Research and Development. I take this opportunity to express my appreciation of their work. I commend the report to the House.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION: DOW CHEMICAL COMPANY

**Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**Mr BANNON:** The Premier, yesterday in the *Advertiser*, and the Deputy Premier today in this House by way of a Ministerial statement, both accused me of in some way breaking confidentiality in discussions I had with the Dow Chemical Company in relation to its decision to concentrate its studies on a petro-chemical project in the Stony Point area. I believe that that allegation, which is untrue, is a grave reflection on me, as Leader of the Opposition. Obviously, it could affect the very good relationships I have with a number of major companies and investors in this State who see fit to take the Opposition into their confidence. Naturally, I am very jealous of those confidences.

I would like to report to the House that on 29 October the member for Mitchell, our shadow Minister of Mines and Energy, and I had confidential discussions on this matter with the Dow Chemical Company. It was, in fact, on the same day as discussions were held with the Government. It was said to us there that the company would like this decision to be kept confidential until such time as it had an opportunity to report to the Port Augusta council, which, of course, had been intimately involved in the work of studying the infra-structure of the proposed Redcliff petro-chemical scheme. Both my shadow Minister and I respected that confidence totally. In fact, it was not until I was advised that the Port Augusta council had been told of this matter that I felt in any way that a statement could be made about it. I was told by the member for Stuart, the member for that area, on Friday 6 November that the company had been informed of its decision and that it was generally known in the Port Augusta area. That is a crucial point: it had become at that time a matter of common knowledge. Therefore, my confidentiality—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr BANNON:** I am about to read to the House a letter that I was studying. My confidentiality was obviously affected by that knowledge. The Deputy Premier claimed that no public announcement was made by Dow. I did not claim that, either. The fact is that the information had been given to the council and had become public in Port Augusta.

On Sunday, there having been no announcement of any sort from any quarter, I was questioned by one of the media about the situation of the petro-chemical plant in the light of our policy. In view of that interest, I rang the *Advertiser* to draw its attention to the draft policy of the A.L.P., which will be debated at the end of this month and which encourages the establishment of a petro-chemical scheme on the western side of Spencer Gulf, near Whyalla, because of the availability of infra-structure and the site's environmental superiority. That was the information I conveyed to the *Advertiser*. In that context I pointed out that we would welcome the decision made by Dow in relation to the change of site. I assure the House (and I have written to the company on this matter), that the Government is totally mischievous in the way in which it is handling this issue.

**PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MEMBER'S REMARKS**

**Mr TRAINER (Ascot Park):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**Mr TRAINER:** During Question Time, I interjected with a remark attributing certain qualities to a member of this Chamber. The Premier, in response to my interjection, implied that my remark had been directed to the Deputy Leader. That was totally incorrect. There was only one member on his feet when I interjected, 'You pompous ass'; that member was the Premier. I have no desire to apply any such term to the Deputy Leader, whom I hold in high esteem. There is only one person in this Chamber to whom I would apply the attributes of pomposity and assinity; that person is the Premier.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I take the opportunity of picking up the point the honourable member has made. I draw to the attention of members on both sides of the House that comments of the nature to which the honourable member for Ascot Park has just drawn attention can be turned against the member and against his colleagues, and are unnecessary comments in the debate or conduct of this House at any time.

**PERSONAL EXPLANATION: DOW CHEMICAL COMPANY**

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Minister of Mines and Energy):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I wish to make a personal explanation in regard to the breach of confidentiality by the Leader of the Opposition mentioned in my Ministerial statement today. I stand by the statement that was made. In support of that, let me read a document that was given to me by the Dow Chemical Company.

**An honourable member:** I hope not in confidence.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** They know that I have it. It is to the General Manager in Sydney. The statement is as follows:

1. Following the Cooper Basin Producers' decision to build fractionation and marine facilities at Stony Point and bring ethane to that location by a pipeline, it is now in Dow's interest to pursue Stony Point as a possible location for a petro-chemical complex.
2. We suggest that it would be appropriate for the Minister of Mines and Energy, Mr Goldsworthy—

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** What is the date of the letter?

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** It is dated 28 October 1981. It pre-dates any breaches by your Leader.

**An honourable member:** He's piqued—

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I am not the slightest bit piqued, because the Leader broke the confidentiality; he cannot get out of it. Now members opposite resort to abuse. The letter continues:

—to make the announcement on our Stony Point decision, since statements have already been made by the Government indicating the possibility of a petro-chemical complex being built at Stony Point.

3. We request Government—

and this was relayed to us and, as I understand it, the Opposition—

not to make any announcement on our decision until after the Cooper Basin Producers' environmental effects statement has been approved (expected November) and after Dow has had discussion with the Port Augusta council.

The first qualification is the one the Leader conveniently overlooks. The Government was respecting that confidentiality, that sensible restriction, as the environmental studies

had not yet been approved. It ill behoves the Leader to get up here and tell a half truth.

**PERSONAL EXPLANATION: DOW CHEMICAL COMPANY**

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Mitchell):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** I thank the House for the approval, and I will be brief. I was present at the discussions referred to by my Leader. I am quite certain that the account he gave to the House was absolutely 100 per cent correct.

*At 3.28 p.m., the bells having been rung:*

**The SPEAKER:** Call on the business of the day.

**COOBER PEDY (LOCAL GOVERNMENT EXTENSION) BILL**

Second reading.

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON (Minister of Environment and Planning):** I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

Last year the Legislative Council appointed a Select Committee to examine the need for local government in Coober Pedy and, if such a need was found to exist, to prepare an address to His Excellency the Governor pursuant to section 23 of the Local Government Act with a view to introducing local government in the relevant area.

The committee reported on 26 November 1980, and in its report recommended as follows:

(a) Your committee has examined the need for local government in Coober Pedy and does not recommend the preparation of an Address to His Excellency the Governor pursuant to section 23 of the Local Government Act, 1934-1980.

(b) On the evidence received, the establishment of full local government, as envisaged in the Local Government Act, is considered inappropriate for Coober Pedy at this stage.

(c) However, your committee believes that a need exists for some legislative backing to be granted to the Coober Pedy Progress and Miners Association to enable it to be responsible for certain local services, and to raise revenue for those purposes, if it wishes to assume such responsibilities.

(d) Therefore, your committee recommends that the best course of action to follow would be for the Government to introduce a Bill for this purpose and that it then be referred to a Select Committee as a basis for discussion with the Coober Pedy community.

The purpose of the present Bill is to give effect to the recommendations of the Select Committee. The Bill therefore confers upon the Coober Pedy Progress and Miners Association certain limited powers of local government. It defines an area in relation to which those powers are to be exercisable. It provides a statutory means by which the association may impose charges upon properties within that area. It defines the various functions that the association may undertake and provides a means by which those functions may be expanded. The operation of the Bill is to be kept under review, and, to ensure that the matter comes before Parliament within a reasonable period, an expiry date of 31 December 1986 is fixed by the Bill. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

**Explanation of Clauses**

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 sets out the defi-

nitions required for the purposes of the new Act. Clause 4 sets out the powers of the association. The association is empowered to build and maintain streets, roads and public places within the area; it may provide and maintain halls, community centres and recreation facilities; it may make provision for the collection and disposal of refuse and establish and maintain depots for the purpose; it may provide and maintain a cemetery in or adjacent to the area; it may provide and maintain an airfield; it may provide and maintain public offices for the purposes of the association; and it may carry out any other function for the benefit of the area determined upon by the association and approved by the Minister.

The association may expend moneys in subscribing or contributing to the provision and maintenance of ambulance services; the provision and maintenance of hospitals and medical and dental services or facilities; the cost of providing and maintaining fire-fighting services under the Country Fires Act; the cost of the acquisition and maintenance of mine rescue equipment and the cost of mine rescue operations; the establishment and maintenance of a library; and any other purpose determined upon by a general meeting of the association and approved by the Minister. Sub-clauses (4), (5) and (6) provide for the extension of appropriate sections of the Local Government Act to the association.

Clause 5 deals with the levy of charges upon land by the association. The association is empowered, with the consent of the Minister, to levy charges in respect of a financial year upon land within the area. The basis upon which these charges is to be levied will be set out in the notice. The provisions of the Local Government Act relating to the recovery of rates, the rebate or deferment of rates, the imposition and remission of fines for non-payment of rates, and the payment of rates by instalment, will apply in relation to charges levied under this section as if they were rates under the Local Government Act.

Clause 6 empowers the association with the consent of the Minister to borrow moneys for the purposes of the new Act. Clause 7 deals with accounts and audit. Clause 8 provides that as from the commencement of the new Act the constitution of the association is to be as set forth in the schedule. The association is not to be dissolved except by authority of Parliament.

Clause 9 deals with interaction between the new Act and the Outback Areas Community Development Trust Act. Clause 10 provides a measure of protection for the Executive Officer of the association. Clause 11 is a regulation making power. Clause 12 provides that the new Act will expire on 31 December, 1986.

Mr HEMMINGS secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### INDUSTRIAL SAFETY, HEALTH AND WELFARE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 22 October. Page 1538.)

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** The Opposition supports the amendments to the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act. The Minister made only a very short explanation, but he covered essentially the purpose of the amending Bill. I will be pleased if it works as well as he says it will. According to the Minister the implementation of the provisions will take 18 months to complete, allowing businesses to pick up the whole of their registrations in one fell swoop. This is certainly an improvement on the old system.

I suppose great credit must go to the Working Party on Small Business Licensing for its recommendations. I can see nothing untoward in the legislation. I hope that it will work as well as the Minister has led us to believe and that the time of 18 months indicated by the Minister will be the final operation date. The Opposition supports the Bill.

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN (Minister of Industrial Affairs):** I thank the Deputy Leader for his comments. I point out that there are two distinct phases of this programme. The first is to ensure that all the various Acts under the control of the Minister of Industrial Affairs have a single billing system. That is fairly complex, as I am sure honourable members will realise people are already slotted in at various intervals over a 12 month period, and we have such a range of various Acts.

The second phase of the programme, once it is adopted by the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment, will be to adopt it for the whole of government. The other major department involved in this area is the Department of Consumer Affairs. The Government is also working in that area, but that is further down the track. The first and most significant move is the move within the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment. I think I am right in saying that two or three Acts will require amendment, as will regulations of other Acts. I expect those amendments to take place in forthcoming months. I thank honourable members for their support for what I think is a very significant move towards deregulating for the private sector.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

#### INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 29 October. Page 1736.)

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** The Opposition supports this Bill. We believe it is a fair measure for South Australian workers, giving them access to sick leave if they fall sick or are injured on annual leave. That is a benefit to which workers under many Federal awards have had access for some time. The Minister explained, when he introduced the Bill, how it found its way into the House. The provision of sick leave whilst on annual leave was the subject of an application by the United Trades and Labor Council in the State Industrial Commission.

While we support the Bill because, first, it is a fair measure for workers, and, secondly, it also provides for something which is very close to the initial application made by the trade union movement, and therefore has general support in the community, there are several matters which demand comment. I refer to the farce that the employer organisations presented in outsmarting themselves, and then running to the Minister for him to get them out of the hot water they had got themselves into.

There is the pathetic performance of the Minister running off, yet again, to do the employers bidding, contrasted to his complete inaction in other pressing areas. This is only one symptom, another act, in the tragedy of Government that South Australians have had to witness over the last two years, and there are reasons for that which go right to the heart of how this Government operates.

The United Trades and Labor Council initiated an application in the Industrial Commission to get workers to use their sick leave if they fall sick or are injured on annual leave and cannot have the benefits that annual leave is

meant to give. What the unions asked for was very much what this Bill now seeks to provide, but at that time the employers opposed it. The Chamber of Commerce and Industry, the Employers Federation and others went with their lawyers and Q.C.s to the Full Industrial Court, and argued that to grant the application would offend the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act.

The Labor Council did that, and amended its application to ask for 10 days additional leave for workers who could not fully benefit from their annual leave because of sickness or injury, without using up any of their sick leave entitlements. That application was listed before a Full Bench of the Industrial Commission. The United Trades and Labor Council put its case over two days, and an adjournment was granted to enable the employers to prepare their reply. The employers were to put their case on Wednesday 28 October. On Friday 16 October, they called the United Trades and Labor Council over the telephone to an urgent meeting where they put a verbal offer to the union representatives who were able to be present.

The offer was that a joint approach should be made to the Minister to ask him to introduce a Bill such as the one before the House. This verbal offer was communicated to the Labor Council in the following week. By the time a meeting of unions was arranged at very short notice on the following Monday, the 26th, on that very same day the Minister had this Bill before Cabinet. I will say more about that in a moment. Before I move on, I simply point out the staggering incompetence and arrogance of those employer organisations.

I ask the House to reflect on that statement. When the claim was first put to the employers by the unions they opposed it with every means at their disposal. In a matter of a few weeks, a matter of days after hearing the trade union case, the employers obviously made the assessment that they were going to lose the case, and ran off to the Minister. Having wasted the time of the Full Bench of the Industrial Court, the Full Bench of the Industrial Commission, a number of advocates, research staff witnesses, and counsel over a period of four months, the employer organisations then had the gall to go to the Minister to get him to fix things up for them, so that they can agree to the original claim, which could have been done previously. In doing that, they did not even have the decency, or perhaps it was the organisational or administrative capacity, to write a letter to the Trades and Labor Council to tell the unions what they were doing. I hope, for the sake of South Australia, that these employer organisations are not representative of the type of management material that we have available to us in this State. I find it hard to believe that it could be so pathetically incompetent.

However, the role of the Minister in this is even more disturbing, and I turn to that now, because it very clearly illustrates exactly what the Minister is up to in the way in which he handles his portfolio. It equally clearly illustrates what a sad and sorry Government South Australia has at the moment. It was a matter of, at the very most, two weeks, between the first approach being made to the Minister by the employers and the first reading of this Bill in Parliament. The remarkable speed with which the Minister snapped to attention and threw the resources of his department into fishing the employers out of the stew that they had got themselves into is impressive, to say the least.

**The Hon. D. C. Brown:** That statement is not true.

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** The Minister can correct it later if he wants to.

**Mr Lewis:** You can't stand up there and tell fibs like that.

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** The Minister can correct my statements later, if he wishes. I am acting on the informa-

tion before me. It is the quickest that this Government has moved since it has been in office, and it stands out in stark contrast to the way in which the Minister has responded when he has been asked to do something for the workers of South Australia. The matter I have in mind is the escalation of workers compensation lump sum payments in South Australia. The maximum lump sum payment for a permanently incapacitated worker, or for his family, if he is killed on the job, now stands at \$25 000 and has not moved since 1974. It is a matter of record that a private member's Bill introduced into this House to remedy the situation was defeated by the Government.

**The Hon. D. C. Brown:** What has this got to do with the Bill?

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** It is making a comparison between how the Government acts when it wants to assist employers and when it is supposed to assist the workers. That is the comparison. An amount of \$25 000 is barely the equivalent of two years wages. If a family invests that amount, even at 15 per cent per annum, it can expect a return of a paltry \$3 750 a year. Since the lump sum was set in 1974, inflation has eroded it, depreciated it, by a factor of 57 per cent. It is now worth only 43 per cent of what it was worth in 1974. This is a pressing and urgent matter that affects injured South Australian workers and their families and requires immediate attention.

I am informed that, on behalf of its members, the Trades and Labor Council has approached the Minister on numerous occasions seeking an amendment of the Workers Compensation Act to put the situation right. Approaches have been made verbally and in writing, with reasoned argument and supporting material. Has the Minister done anything at all to remedy things in the last two years while he has had the opportunity to do so? Not on your life! He has not budged on the issue. I am informed that his latest response was that the Government intends to review the legislation next year, so the workers can wait until then.

It is quite a different story when the employers get themselves into a mess through their own incompetence. The Minister acts then, and acts quickly. Notwithstanding that there is in progress an inquiry into the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act; notwithstanding that the organisation which represents the vast majority of the people who will be affected by the amendments, the Trades and Labor Council, is not even consulted about it; there is an amendment inside two weeks, but when he is asked to do something for workers and their families who are killed or injured at work, they can wait for up to three years.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I do hope that the honourable member will link his remarks to the Bill.

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** I certainly will, Sir. I think that there is quite a contrast and quite a comparison made in those remarks.

**The Hon. D. C. Brown:** It has nothing to do with the Bill at all.

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** It has something to do with the performance of this Government, and that is the important thing that I am talking about. Why is this the case? It is, of course, not the first time it has happened this year. Honourable members will recall, no doubt, the fiasco of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act Amendment Bill (No. 1) of 1981 that was introduced into the House with great haste by the Minister. The circumstances were slightly different; on that occasion the employers organisations had been well and truly beaten on logic and the arguments in the Industrial Commission. That having happened, they ran to the Minister to ask him to change the rules to make sure it could not happen again. Their performance in the Industrial Commission in that State wage case in May was so pathetic that the Full Bench of the

commission was constrained to comment in its decision on their 'cavalier attitude'. The employers learned a lesson in that instance. In this case they have not waited for the commission to give a decision.

It presents a sorry picture of a Minister and a Government doing the bidding of one sectional interest group while displaying the greatest reluctance to do anything for the working people. The explanation for this Byzantine style of Government that an observer is compelled to reach is that we have a Government engaged in paying off a debt to its financial backers, paying off the employer organisations for the massive support which they gave it and which put it in office in September 1979. This is no way to run a Government. It is a disgraceful serving of narrow sectional interest for past favours, and such a Government is unworthy to be the Government of South Australia.

While I can assure the Government that we will support the Bill and not seek to amend it or oppose it, I can also assure the Government that more and more South Australians are becoming aware of the sort of Government they have and the disgraceful way in which it operates for sectional interests.

I think one point is worth placing on record. Perhaps the Minister, when he replies, or in Committee, will explain why a three-day minimum has been inserted in the Bill. This aspect is really my only objection. I think that the provisions of the Bill are adequate and consistent with what is happening generally in awards in Australia, except for that provision, which allows for three-day minimum standards. Research in this area has revealed that 30 Federal awards, which have been in operation for some time and which go back to 1973, 1974, and 1975, have no minimum standards set.

I do not intend to move amendments to this Bill. I believe that, if this agreement was worked out outside this House by the parties involved (and those parties should have been the Trades and Labor Council and the employer organisations, which failed to do that and got the Minister to intervene), it is not incumbent upon the Opposition to remove, add to or amend any of the provisions of this legislation. There should have been a firm agreement between those parties. I place on record that I believe consideration could have been given, either by the Minister in introducing this legislation, or by argument and agreement with those parties who have asked him to act in this area (the employer organisations, in the first instance), to reconsidering the three-day minimum, consistent with what is happening in Federal awards. As I said previously, other minima set in Federal awards are of three, four or five days, but no minimum is set beyond five days. I believe that, if a man is sick while on leave, no minimum number of days should be set; he should be entitled to his sick leave credits while on annual leave from the moment he gets sick.

I place on record my objection to a three-day minimum and indicate that a future Labor Government will consider reassessing the situation. When we are in Government, which will not be very long—

**Mr Ashenden:** Don't hold your breath.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** Well, the honourable member may laugh, but I indicate that, on return to the Treasury benches, which will not be very long, we will certainly be reassessing these provisions. The Opposition supports the legislation.

**Mr WHITTEN (Price):** I rise briefly to support my Deputy Leader, who said that the Bill was the result of consultation with the employers and was intended to get the employers out of a hole. The employers opposed this measure in the court and ran to the Minister to get them out of

their trouble, and this is the result. Certainly, the employers could have achieved the same result by not opposing the action in the court. I note in the Australian Hotels Association *Hotel Gazette* of October, under the heading 'Annual leave to cover sickness while on annual leave':

A test case was proceeding to decide on a union application for up to 10 days per year extra annual leave if annual leave was interrupted by illness. The application, in its current form, was supported by the T.L.C. and was being opposed by the major employer organisations.

This matter went to the Full Court of the South Australian Industrial Court, and it is now before us in the form of remedial legislation introduced by the Minister. I believe, as the Deputy Leader has said, that there should be no minimum of three days and that any sick leave whatsoever should be able to be taken, perhaps not with a doctor's certificate but with a statutory declaration to the effect that the employee concerned was sick and unable to enjoy his leave. That day could then be taken off annual leave, and I think that that is what should have happened. Many awards provide for an employee to take his sick leave whilst on annual leave, and I ask the Minister to look at the suggestion made and to bring the period back from three days to perhaps one, requiring either a doctor's certificate or perhaps a statutory declaration of sickness, so that there would be no loss of annual leave if an employee was sick for only one or two days.

Finally, I am pleased to hear the Deputy Leader pledge that the next incoming Labor Government will repeal this type of legislation and provide for what I have been advocating, namely, that there be no restriction on the days to be taken on sick leave.

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** Like my colleagues, I support the Bill, although I question the quick footwork of the Minister in introducing this Bill. One could suggest that such an introduction was prompted by pressure from employer groups, who it seems were of the opinion that the case by the unions in the commission was of such validity that better provisions could well have been achieved. I know from past experience in the organisation in which I worked, whilst it was under a Federal award, that employees were able to take sick leave while on annual leave when they felt sick. Certainly this provision is long overdue and, as has been pointed out by my Deputy Leader and the member for Price, the need for recognition of the fact that workers do become sick is long overdue. I hope that within the next 12 months, when the Labor Party is returned to office, we will recognise the fact that workers, should they have one day's sick leave during annual leave, should be entitled to take that sick leave. I applaud the sentiments expressed and the undertaking given by my Deputy Leader that that will occur.

I will not canvass the need for amendments to the Workers Compensation Act, as that matter has been so ably covered by the Deputy Leader. However, I am concerned that the Government has been so tardy in introducing certain amendments, yet where it seems that pressure is applied by employer groups the Government bows to that pressure. I support the Bill.

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN (Minister of Industrial Affairs):** I think two points have been raised by members in what was a most unenlightening and disappointing debate. The first was whether the timing, as outlined by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, is correct. I can indicate to the Deputy Leader that his timing was incorrect—

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** It was three weeks instead of two, was it?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** I deny the timing that he spelt out. I cannot recall the exact dates and events, but I know that the time was substantially more than the two weeks that he referred to. The second point is that I detect from members opposite that, although they all support the Bill, they are worried about the speed with which it is being passed. If they are concerned about that, would they like me to defer the matter until the new year?

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Russack):** Order!

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** I just wonder, because only three speakers have spoken on the Bill from the opposition side of the House, and all three have expressed concern at the speed with which it is apparently being rushed through this Parliament. I am offering to have the measure lie on the table until the new year.

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** The employers wouldn't let you; they're your boss.

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** I will decide whether or not it lies on the table. I am not worried about the employers or the trade unions, but I am making this offer to the Opposition to have the measure lie on the table. I sense from the way all three members interjected that they want the Bill passed as quickly as possible. If that is the case, perhaps we should allow the Bill to proceed, but I note the hypocrisy of members opposite as between what they said and what is now their attitude. The only valid point in the debate was that raised by the member for Price as to whether or not the period for which the person is sick should be three days and whether a doctor's certificate should be issued. The Secretary of the United Trades and Labor Council has written to me on that point, and we have given it some thought. The Government believes that it is appropriate to leave the matter as it is.

**Mr Hamilton:** Why?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** Because we have thought about it, and we think it is appropriate to leave it that way. For that reason, it is not the Government's intention to amend the Bill as requested by the member for Price.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

#### PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 1 October. Page 1351.)

**Mr CRAFTER (Norwood):** The Opposition supports this brief Bill which seeks to extend the powers vested in the Prices Commissioner in this State for a further period of three years. The history of price control in this State has been catalogued in the speech in another place by the Hon. Mr Sumner which I commend to members and in which he raised some of the basic philosophies of the respective Parties with respect to price control at State level.

It seems to me that the Government is acting in a most unusual way in bringing in a further period of three years of price control when its stated policy clearly is to take the State out of the market place. There can be no greater interference in the market place than by price control. We have seen in recent years the great difficulties that this Government has had in wrestling with the problems of price control, particularly when it acted with a great deal of indecision in relation to petrol pricing and the price of beer. A great deal of harm was caused to consumers and to traders as a result of the Government's indecision in this regard.

In the Budget Estimates Committee the Minister of Consumer Affairs revealed that there would be staff cuts in the

area of price control. This is of great concern to the Opposition because, as long as there is legislation that brings down some vestige of price control in our community, we believe that it should be administered properly. From the documentation provided to the Estimates Committee of which I was a member, it seems to me that no staff will be made available in the current financial year for the monitoring of price control; previously that work was done by two officers, with additional assistance being provided. In evidence to the Committee the Minister gave varying explanations of how prices would be monitored.

I believe that the areas concerned are of vital importance, particularly to parents of children who are attending schools. I refer to school requisites at the manufacture and retail level, textbooks for primary and secondary schools, retail, meat pies and pasties, aerated waters, and ice cream. Medical services is another area that one could bring into the general category of price control that will affect the family. Of broader interest but nonetheless vital to the economy of this State, particularly to the building industry, is price control of roofing tiles, clay bricks, concrete bricks and blocks and, of course, petroleum products other than aviation gasoline. Whilst the Government seeks to have these items on the books subject to a form of price control and a form of monitoring their prices, it has made no provision in the Budget for staff to administer this. I suggest to honourable members that this is a facade of some kind. The Government has rearranged the work of the Prices Commissioner and has weakened the effect of price control in this State. One can only anticipate a slow removal of the State from the area of price control *in toto*.

We hear much from the Government about the effect of wage increases on the economy and in particular on inflation in this country, and also its relationship with unemployment. However, the Government is never prepared to talk about the need for effective price control in bringing about a social contract in this country so that we can arrest the evils of increasing unemployment and increasing inflation. Yet, we find that, because of the constitutional oddities under which our country has been established, price control is a State matter and is a preserve of the States and that that has meant considerable difficulties over the years. It seems that there has been little preparedness by this Government to talk to other State Governments and indeed the Federal Government to try to bring about some sharing of powers in relation to price control so that we can bring down effective controls.

I think all honourable members would realise that it is difficult indeed for States to act alone in relation to price control. Nonetheless, it is most important that wherever possible there is some regulation in the market place to protect not only the interests of consumers but also those of many businesses which are large employers in this State and which have long established records of service to the community. Many of those will slowly come under greater threat from larger interstate corporations as price control is reduced. In relation to merchandise that affects the family, namely, staple food which one considers is necessary for daily life, bread, milk, flour, and the requisites for schoolchildren, such as clothing and textbooks, and other essential items for the community, we see that price control is being slowly watered down. It is most alarming to find out that there will be no staff to administer some provisions of this Bill.

The Opposition takes this opportunity to restate its firm commitment, not for price control across the board—some lavish intervention in the market place—but to bring about sanity, and a basic protection which the community has come to expect from Government. The report of the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs last year referred



to some expectations from the business community that the Government would remove itself altogether from the area of consumer prices.

There was some resistance from persons in the market place to that department's activities, because it did not believe that the Government would enforce its legislation in this area. One can only be sceptical, if that is the attitude abroad in the community, that we will not see in the months ahead a further diminution of Government activity in this area. We can only predict that this will have harmful effects on the purchasing power of those who look most to government to protect their interests and to provide some basic support for their very existence. The Opposition supports this measure, with the reservations to which I have referred.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Minister of Health):** I am glad to have the Opposition's support for this measure, although it is, as the honourable member said, somewhat muted and with reservations. In response to the general tenor of the honourable member's remarks, I refute his assertion that the Government has taken unusual action in this regard. It is not unusual. It has been done before. Certainly, there is no indecision by the Government on prices. On the contrary, its attitude has been consistent with that of its Liberal predecessors. Generally, we believe that prices should be set in the market place, but, where the market place is obviously not operating in the consumers' best interests, for example, in circumstances of monopolies or cartels, we believe that it is appropriate for a Government to intervene with some form of price control. The extension of price control until 31 December 1984 is entirely consistent with Government policy, and with its Liberal predecessors' policy, which appears to have broadly based support throughout the State.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

#### STATUTE REVISION (FRUIT PESTS) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 22 October. Page 1538.)

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury):** This Bill makes two essential provisions, on which the Opposition will be brief, because the Bill does not contain a great deal. The Minister took less than two minutes to introduce the Bill. The two provisions are, first, changing compensation payment provisions for people who have had fruit stripped from trees as a result of infestation of one sort or another, and changing it from the Fruit Fly Compensation Committee to payments being made with direct Ministerial approval, rather than going through committees.

The other proposal is to disband most of the committees that deal with infestations of certain sorts connected with fruit in this State, simply because in some instances, apparently, the infestations have become rather more widespread and are best dealt with at the State level rather than at the local level.

The Opposition's only question concerns the transfer of moneys to the Crown, referred to in the Minister's second reading speech. How much money is involved with those committees? Secondly, I ask whether any consideration was given at any stage to those moneys being paid to a source other than the Crown. I raise that point, because the money held by the Oriental Fruit Moth Control Committee, the Red Scale Control Committee, and the San Jose Control Committee was raised by levies on farmers in particular areas. Their assets came from those sources. I believe that it was proposed in some quarters that the money should be

returned to those who made the payments. I do not know whether that is entirely possible or practical, but I ask the Minister whether this proposition was considered and, if not, why not.

Beyond that, the machinery proposed in this Bill is fairly mundane, which is not a kind word. It is important that some of these changes be made, because we are all concerned about the extent of fruit infestation in this State. Nevertheless, it is reasonably pedestrian and will not be raised as a contentious issue in this House. Indeed, some of the Bill's proposals were in the pipeline with the previous Government. They have merrily worked their way along that pipeline and have now finally surfaced. Will the Minister give an undertaking that information will be given about the amount of money involved, and about what other options were considered as to the disbursement of that money from the committees that are due to be disbanded? If the Government can give that undertaking, the Opposition will support the Bill.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN (Minister of Agriculture):** I understand that the member for Salisbury has asked certain questions, to which I will make every effort to provide answers.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—'Repeal of certain Acts.'

**Mr TRAINER:** Will the repeal of the Red Scale Control Act be an example of red scales in the sunset legislation?

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** No. The question raised by the member has no relevance to the proposed repeal.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### ESSENTIAL SERVICES BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it insisted on its amendments to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

Consideration in Committee.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier):** I move:

That the House of Assembly insist on its disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments.

Motion carried.

A message was sent to the Legislative Council requesting a conference at which the House of Assembly would be represented by Messrs Bannon, D. C. Brown, Goldsworthy, McRae, and Randall.

#### COOPER PEDY (LOCAL GOVERNMENT EXTENSION) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 1787.)

**Mr HEMMINGS (Napier):** I state at the outset how grateful I am for members of the House to make so much time available to me to speak on this very important subject. In one respect, one must congratulate the Select Committee and the Government, in effect, for coming forward with this Select Committee recommendation and the Bill that is now before us. A precedent has been set in this Bill, in that it confers limited powers of local government to an associ-

ation, in this case, the Coober Pedy Progress and Miners Association Incorporated.

It is well known that it is A.L.P. policy that all unincorporated areas within the State be brought under the umbrella of local government wherever it is practicable. In this case, the Select Committee decided in its wisdom that limited local powers should be given to that particular area. I have my own personal doubts whether this is sufficient, but I wish the Coober Pedy Progress and Miners Association well in its endeavours to bring some form of local government to Coober Pedy.

In reading the Select Committee's report, it was obvious that the community at Coober Pedy wanted just the minimum standards as outlined in the Bill. Experience will show whether that is sufficient. I am pleased that a certain time is set in 1986 when this Bill will come before the Parliament to see whether or not that experiment has been a success.

I should like to describe briefly the Coober Pedy Progress and Miners Association. It is a responsible group of people which has been in operation for many years. I understand that it is keen to use wisely the power given to it, and I am sure that it will do that if it is humanly possible. This group has been given a wide range of functions. When one looks at clause 4, one could question whether it really involves limited powers, because basically the functions that this group is being allowed to administer are what are being provided by local government elsewhere.

The association is given powers to build and maintain streets, roads and public places; to provide for the lighting of streets, roads and public places; to provide for any other amenities in or related to streets, roads and places; to provide for the generation and transmission of electricity; provide for the reticulation and supply of water; and provide and maintain halls, community centres and recreation facilities in the area. I will dwell later on the area of halls, community centres and recreation facilities.

The association provides for the collection and disposal of refuse and the establishment and maintenance of depots for that purpose; the maintenance of a cemetery; the maintenance of an airfield; and provides and maintains public offices for the purposes of the association. It may expend money in subscribing or contributing to the cost of provision and maintenance of ambulance services; the provision and maintenance of hospital, medical and dental services; the maintenance of fire-fighting services; the acquisition and maintenance of mine rescue equipment and the cost of mine rescue operations; and the establishment and maintenance of a library. Some local government bodies in the metropolitan area and in country areas do not have the power to undertake some of those functions.

When one looks at the fairly extensive range of functions that the Coober Pedy Progress and Miners Association has, one poses certain questions. Will that association have recourse to Federal and State funding that other local government areas have? Will the Grants Commission make an allocation to the association? The Minister needs to clarify that situation during the Committee stages. This Bill is an experiment in the field of local government. We on this side of the House wish it well, but we hope that, if problems arise in the future, and if full local government is requested by the people of Coober Pedy, the Government will act speedily to legislate in that direction.

**Mr GUNN (Eyre):** I support the Bill. I have been involved with the Coober Pedy Progress Association, which became the Coober Pedy Progress and Miners Association, ever since I have had the privilege of being the member for the District of Eyre. Early in my time of dealing with that association a fairly strong view was held within the community of Coober Pedy that the last thing it wanted was to

come under any form of local government. However, as time has passed, and the town has grown and developed, the need for services has become evident to the community, as have the problems which have been put upon a small group of people, and which in some cases, have been almost too much for those people to bear. I believe that few people would recognise the hard work that a large number of people in that community have done on a voluntary basis on behalf of all the people of Coober Pedy. People such as Mr Hyatt and others have been president or secretary of the association and have given a tremendous amount of their time.

**Mr Keneally:** You missed some significant members of the association. Was that deliberate?

**Mr GUNN:** The member for Stuart is attempting to sidetrack me. I was saying that those people have worked very hard on behalf of their local communities. In recent times it has become evident to them that it is necessary to have some form of local control; I suppose that is the price of progress. In the past the Progress and Miners Association has been funded basically by the revenue which it received from the drive-in. However, when it was announced that a local television service was to be made available to the area, it was obvious to most people that, when the service commenced operation, it would have an effect on the revenue from the drive-in.

That did occur, and it was not long before the association was not able to fund the operation, and it became clear that other forms of revenue would be necessary. After a great deal of soul-searching and consideration, the Minister of Local Government was invited to attend an annual general meeting of the Progress and Miners Association at Coober Pedy. I had the pleasure of accompanying him to the meeting, together with some of his officers. This matter was considered at some length, and after a very responsible debate it was put to the meeting, and carried, that a form of local government be investigated.

The Select Committee was set up, and the result of that Committee is a Bill which will give the progress association virtually the power of local government. It is fairly obvious that, as time goes on, we will need to look at this legislation. I think that, by the time the legislation expires in 1986, the community will probably be ready to accept full local government. However, that will be a decision for the community at that time. Following the meeting with the Minister of Local Government, I wanted to make sure that the association still held the same view. Therefore, I wrote to the Coober Pedy Progress and Miners Association seeking its views, and I received a letter dated 13 March 1981, as follows:

Dear Graham,

The committee requests that you make representation on the association's behalf to the Minister of Local Government regarding the recommendations made in the Select Committee Report on Local Government in Coober Pedy.

The committee believes that it is imperative that action is taken soon to begin work on the recommendations listed as 5 and 6 in the report.

The association's financial position at present is dire and if the present trend regarding revenue from the drive-in continues it will be impossible for the association to continue to function as in the past.

Yours faithfully,  
Neville Hyatt,  
President.

I was pleased to receive that letter. On 25 March I wrote to the Hon. Mr Hill, as follows:

Please find enclosed a copy of a letter which I received from the President of the Coober Pedy Progress and Miners Association. I understand that you are having current legislation drafted, and I hope you can proceed with it as soon as possible.

I have read those letters into *Hansard* to make perfectly clear that there was a request from the association, so that

in the future there can be no doubt about what took place. Anyone who has visited Coober Pedy will be aware that the town has grown rapidly. There is a need for a number of projects to be completed, and certain services should have been provided. Being a voluntary organisation, the association has had virtually no full-time officers in a position to assist. If this legislation is to be successful, it will be necessary for the Department of Local Government to assist for at least the first 12 months.

I think it will be necessary to provide officers to assist in getting the new organisation off the ground, and to assist with the various requirements that local government usually puts into effect. I think that the Deputy Director of the Department of Local Government will be the person required to spend quite a bit of his time at Coober Pedy in the next few months.

**Mr Mathwin:** Very good people, aren't they—very able?

**Mr GUNN:** Yes, the Progress and Miners Association has been a good association.

**Mr Keneally:** John Thrower, Poblecki, and all those Labor Party people in the organisation—good people.

**Mr GUNN:** I was pointing out, before the member for Stuart endeavoured to contravene Standing Orders by interjecting, how necessary it is for the Minister's department to play a major role in assisting these people during the next few months. During the course of his speech the member for Napier raised the question of whether the Grants Commission will be making grants to this new organisation. I understand that that will be the case; the area will no longer be in a position to receive grants from the Outback Areas Community Development Trust, but will qualify under the South Australian Grants Commission. I expect that it will be receiving substantial assistance in the beginning to help it on its way. I understand that the financial position of the organisation is not healthy, and that it will require a considerable amount of money to get off to a good start.

**Mr Mathwin:** It deserves all the encouragement it can get.

**Mr GUNN:** Quite. As my colleague said, it does need all the encouragement it can get.

**Mr Keneally:** Perhaps we can send the member for Glenelg up there.

**Mr GUNN:** The member for Glenelg has had considerable experience in local government, unlike the member for Stuart, who has not had any experience in that area, and who would not be aware of the benefits that responsible representation can bring to local communities. The member for Glenelg has served local government with distinction and I am sure he could be of assistance to the people of Coober Pedy. When he has visited the area with me he has been well received indeed, as is the local member when he goes there.

I was endeavouring, before being interrupted, to outline some of the matters that I think will cause problems. We know that the airport has caused great concern to the Progress and Miners Association over a considerable time. After a great deal of hassling and discussion, argument and representation, that matter was brought to fruition. Unfortunately, there have been one or two minor problems with the construction, but I hope that, over the next day or two, remedial action will have been taken to rectify them.

**Mr Keneally interjecting:**

**Mr GUNN:** I believe that, if Coober Pedy had had a local government authority, the airport would have been sealed earlier. I suggest to the member for Stuart, who is continuing to interject, that he ought to look at the airport in his own town of Port Augusta and make some representation about it and not go on with snide, political comments, as he has been doing, because that airport is an absolute

disgrace to the area. It certainly reflects on the local State member and the Federal member, who have done nothing to get their local home town airport upgraded. The member for Stuart is trying to make political capital of the matter I have mentioned. I have probably landed on that airstrip as often as the honourable member has in recent times.

I hope that the people of Coober Pedy are well served by this measure. It was interesting to note the comment of the member for Napier that it is the policy of the A.L.P. to extend local government throughout the length and breadth of South Australia to include all unincorporated areas. That is a policy that the Opposition was not prepared to put into effect when in Government, so it is interesting that he now says that is Opposition policy, because it had nearly 10 years of Government to implement that matter.

**Mr Keneally:** We prepared the ground for you. We did all the hard slogging.

**Mr GUNN:** That is nonsense. I made a lengthy trip around my district and what was portion of the District of Frome with Dr McPhail when this matter was debated at length and when matters of limited local government were discussed. I remember attending a large meeting at Coober Pedy at which a detailed explanation was given by Dr McPhail, in his usual capable manner.

**Mr Keneally:** You did not say so at the time.

**Mr GUNN:** I said at the time that, as a diligent local member, I would be guided by the judgment of my constituents. I made representations on that basis. There was a meeting attended by, I think, more than 400 people, who were most vocal. I felt rather sorry for Dr McPhail on that occasion. One could not help but be impressed by the views of my constituents. Following that meeting, I understand that a plebiscite was held in which letters were sent to every person inviting them to vote, whether they were in favour of or against local government. I understand that more than 60 per cent of the people declined to have any form of local administration.

**Mr Keneally:** You were opposing it; you have done a somersault.

**Mr GUNN:** I have always said (unlike the member for Stuart) that, as the local member, I would support what the majority of people at Coober Pedy wanted. That should be the role of the local member. The member for Stuart, no matter what he thought about this matter, was cunning enough to know that it was to his electoral advantage to support my colleague, the member for Rocky River.

**Mr O'Neill:** And what do you think he put it up for?

**Mr GUNN:** Because he was a diligent local member, that is why he put the matter up; he was reacting to the needs of the people. This matter is far too important for me to be side-tracked by members opposite. I am pleased to support this Bill and I look forward to its operation. I sincerely hope that it meets the needs and aspirations of the people at Coober Pedy and will work to their benefit; that facilities will be provided which they require and which most other communities accept as normal; and that, if problems arise in relation to this matter, the Government will be prepared to give them urgent consideration and, where necessary, act upon them to alleviate any anomalies or difficulties. I sincerely hope that the Department of Local Government will be able to extend assistance, especially in the early stages of these new arrangements, to the Miners and Progress Association to help it get on with the job in a way that will benefit all the citizens of Coober Pedy.

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON (Minister of Environment and Planning):** I want to take the opportunity to thank the House for its support of this important legislation.

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** Now sit down.

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** Do not tell me to sit down; I will sit down when I am ready. I would particularly like to thank the member for Eyre for his local input. I can assure him that, as far as the need for extra funding is concerned, it is recognised by the Government that assistance will be necessary. I am told that a rating process for the second half of this financial year is being considered at this stage. On the question raised by the Opposition regarding Federal and State funding and funding through the grants scheme, I can assure the Opposition that the association will be recognised for funding from both the State and Federal Governments.

**Mr Keneally:** But will they get any? You're recognising them and appreciating them but not giving any commitment.

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** It is very difficult for me to give a commitment as far as the Federal Government is concerned. On the question of assistance on the part of the Grants Commission, also I assure the Opposition that the association will be eligible for funding from the State Grants Commission.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—'Powers of the Association.'

**Mr HEMMINGS:** Does the Government intend that the provision of halls, community centres and recreation facilities in the area will be provided from rates raised by the association, or will there be a special first-off grant to give the association a start in this very important first year?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** I understand that it will not come from rates and that financial assistance will have to be given—

**Mr Keneally:** From the State Government?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** —that financial assistance will have to be given. I take the point that the amount involved is fairly significant when you are talking about maintaining halls, community centres, recreation facilities, etc. If details are required of amounts that would be asked for by the association, I would be happy to get that information for the honourable member.

**Mr HEMMINGS:** If one looks at the results of the recent Budget on the capital works programme, involving either local government or recreation and sport, for example, no money is available this financial year for the kind of facilities so desperately needed in those areas. Could the Minister be a little bit more explicit concerning where the money would be coming from and when the residents of Coober Pedy would get a community hall and recreation facilities? It is all very well for the Bill to say that the association has the power to provide for this, but it is fairly obvious that money has to come from the State Government to provide the initial finance, bearing in mind that the Minister has just said it does not come from rates.

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** I understand that the answer that I have just given the House is incorrect; I think I explained it the wrong way around. The money will be coming not from grants in this particular instance but from rates; I reverse that situation. The money will be coming from rates.

**Mr HEMMINGS:** I seek your guidance, Mr Chairman. I have two further questions on clause 4, dealing with clause 4 (2) (b) and clause 4 (2) (e). Am I bound by your ruling that only three questions are allowed on one particular clause?

**The CHAIRMAN:** The honourable member is not bound by my ruling; he is bound by the Standing Orders. I suggest that he ask both questions now.

**Mr HEMMINGS:** Thank you, Sir. Clause 4 (2), in paragraphs (b) and (e), involves some costly items, namely, the

'provision and maintenance of hospitals and medical and dental services or facilities' and the 'establishment and maintenance of a library'. It has been established that the provision of medical and dental services in this State has been stretched to the limit; in fact, there has been a downturn in the provision of these facilities throughout the State. Further, no funding is available under local government for capital works for the building of libraries, and the subsidy to local government bodies has been reduced by \$660 000. Will the Minister say where the funding will come from for hospital, medical and dental services to the people of Coober Pedy and for establishment, maintenance and ongoing expenditure for library facilities?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** As I said earlier, it is recognised that many of the areas covered in this legislation are costly, whether we are looking at the provision and maintenance of fire-fighting services, or whether it be the cost of providing hospitals, as referred to by the honourable member opposite, or the establishment and maintenance of a library. The Government is presently providing a new hospital for that area. The Bill gives the association power to provide funds if it so desires.

**Mr Hemmings:** So they have to borrow them to get those facilities?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** I am not too sure about dental provisions, but I know that a new hospital is being provided.

**Mr Hemmings:** What about libraries?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** They can take out a loan for that. I am not sure when the hospital will be completed, but I can ascertain whether the dental services are provided in that area as well.

Clause passed.

Clause 5—'Levy of charges on land in the area.'

**Mr HEMMINGS:** Can the Minister say how the charge will be levied and on what basis?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** I will have to get that information from the responsible Minister. I cannot answer that, but I will certainly get that information.

**Mr HEMMINGS:** I do not wish to labour the point, but I understand that there is an officer in the Chamber who could provide the Committee with that information. We all know how the rate is struck in local government areas. I am not talking about a monetary figure but about a formula. This clause does not give that information and I believe it is relevant to what we are discussing.

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** I am informed that it is meant to be flexible but it is in fact similar to the local government rating procedure in which an assessment will be made and a rate struck on that assessment.

**Mr HEMMINGS:** I spent 10 years in local government, and I do know that a property is assessed and a rate struck on that assessment. I would hope that the Minister would give me credit for knowing that. How is the assessment to be made in Coober Pedy? Will it be reached on the size of the block, the number of buildings on the block, the unimproved value, or the improved value? That is what I want to know.

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** I am told that it will be a combination of the land values and the improved values.

**Mr Peterson:** I think all the property at Coober Pedy is Crown land and is leased.

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** Some of the land is freehold, but it is spelt out in the Bill.

Clause passed.

Clauses 6 to 9 passed.

Clause 10—'Application of Part IXAA of Local Government Act.'

**Mr HEMMINGS:** In relation to this clause (which was clause 8b in the Bill in the other place), the Minister in that place said:

Clause 8b gives protection to the executive officer who is going to be appointed and who will have the role of a town clerk in Coober Pedy in the same way as town clerks have protection under the Local Government Act. We feel that it is proper, fair and just for such a person, who will undoubtedly come under much pressure locally, to have the same protection as clerks have elsewhere in regard to security of employment.

The Opposition endorses those sentiments, but I want to know whether the qualifications for the new executive officer of Coober Pedy will be the same as the qualifications required by a town clerk in any other local government area.

**Mr Keneally:** Or could the Minister take the job?

**The CHAIRMAN:** I suggest to the member for Stuart that interjections are completely out of order.

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** No, he will not be required to be qualified as is the case with a town clerk in a local government authority.

**Mr HEMMINGS:** What are the qualifications to be required by the executive officer of Coober Pedy?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** I think it is common sense that he would need to be a good administrator and that he would have some ability in accounting, but it is not specified. I think that the questioning from the Opposition on this is a little finicky. I would have not thought it was necessary to have it spelt out in the legislation, but I hope that answers the question.

**Mr HEMMINGS:** I take umbrage at that. I am not being finicky. Anyone involved in local government would know that it is running into problems in the administration of the Act because in many cases in the past the qualifications of the town clerk have been insufficient. I think that is an accepted comment, and that is no reflection on town clerks in general. I believe anyone involved in local government would agree with that comment. This is an experiment and many people, especially people in outback areas, will be looking at it closely.

I congratulate the Select Committee on its recommendations and the Government on bringing the Bill forward. If the Minister believes that all the executive officer needs is a bit of administrative ability and a bit of accountancy I believe the project is doomed to failure.

I cannot ask any more questions under Standing Orders. I have had to waste two to try to get my point across to the Minister, but this is an important clause. If it could be specified that a certain level of accountancy and a certain level of administrative science are needed I would accept it, but I cannot accept such a generalised requirement, because the whole local government area is now looking at upgrading the qualifications required by town clerks.

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** That has not been specified. But surely, because it is an experiment, we recognise it as an important area of Government responsibility, and because it is important to have local knowledge, we will not specify exactly what is required.

**Mr KENEALLY:** Will the Executive Officer be appointed by the association at Coober Pedy or by the Government?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The Coober Pedy Association will make the appointment.

**Mr KENEALLY:** How can the Government ensure that the person appointed has the necessary qualifications to ensure that the experiment works? With the best will in the world, if the Coober Pedy Progress and Miners Association appoints a local person whose local government experience is limited (because that person comes from Coober Pedy, where there is no local government), does that not then present some problems? I am not reflecting on the association; I am sure that it will make a wise appointment.

Nevertheless, the danger exists. Does the Government intend to have some input on this very important decision?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The Government would certainly want it to be known (and this has already been discussed) that it prefers a person with local expertise to get the association up and running. That person would need certain qualifications. I point out that, if full local government comes to pass in 1986, a qualified clerk will be required then, as is with any local government authority.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (11 and 12), schedule and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

## CREMATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 17 September. Page 999.)

**Mr HEMMINGS (Napier):** This very short Bill should be called the departure tax. It provides another way in this State for people to be sluggish while they are living. The Bill enables those who run crematoriums the right to slug people as they go through the fiery doors. The Government, in its rush to abolish price control in the first days of its office, perhaps did not realise that, although the cost of cremations was still in the hands of the Enfield General Cemetery Trust and the Centennial Park Cemetery Trust, the matter still had to go before the Government for approval. In effect, that was a small check on those people who might want to raise the cost of dying even more than it is now.

Whilst this Bill does not deal with funeral parlours and undertakers in general, it is relevant to the matter about which we are speaking. In many instances, especially in New South Wales, there have been real problems with certain undertakers and funeral parlours and the high cost of dying. In effect, we are forced to support the Bill, but we feel that cremation fees should be subject to price control. There should still be a requirement, as in section 11 of the original Act. This Government will now find that the Enfield General Cemetery Trust and the Centennial Park Cemetery Trust will go on their merry way, increasing the cost of dying in this State.

**Mr PETERSON (Semaphore):** Although this is an odd Bill for me to speak on, I feel very strongly about the fact that we must all die.

**Mr Keneally:** No, Bill McAnaney said 'Possibly'.

**Mr PETERSON:** No. We all must die. That is certain. I am worried that this is becoming a great expense for families who must have the deceased dealt with.

**An honourable member:** It's cheap to die; it's when they bury you.

**Mr PETERSON:** Certainly. Of course, there is no cost to the deceased.

**An honourable member:** You might have a State funeral; you never know.

**Mr PETERSON:** Who knows? I refer to the cost to the family or estate. I have a strong personal feeling that all funeral procedures (cremations and burials) should be Government controlled. That is my personal feeling, and I do not know whether anyone else holds that view. The one thing in life of which one is sure is death, and it worries me that death is becoming expensive.

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** What, is the Government responsible for dying now?

**Mr PETERSON:** Well, you are driving a few to the wall, although I do not know whether you are actually putting them over the wall. In my electorate there is a high per-

centage of older people. They are greatly concerned about having enough money to be 'put away', as they put it, to pay for their funeral. Many are in funeral funds which they assume will cover that cost. They pay a small amount over the years and hope that this will cover it. As the previous member said, this legislation removes (and we are powerless really to do much about it) the one clause from the Act which provided some price control. The cost of funeral services is increasing constantly. The reaction to this is reflected in the growth of funeral services, one of which in Adelaide is called 'Simplicity', which does it on a plain basis and still gets one in the ground or in the oven. The result is the same.

There was one newspaper report the other day stating that it is anticipated that the cost of a burial will shortly reach \$3 000—just for a very plain service. That certainly would be a very great expense on a family. In looking through the newspaper files, I also came across a report on 27 March 1979 which relates to this legislation. Just to read it indicates the growth in the cremation industry percentage. The heading is '70 per cent being cremated'.

**Mr Hemmings:** What do they do with the 30 per cent who are not?

**Mr PETERSON:** There can be a little levity over this matter, but we all have to go down one day, one way or the other. The report said that 70 per cent of people dying in the metropolitan area of Adelaide were being cremated. In the report, Mr James, who was the President of the Australian Funeral Directors Association, forecast that the 70 per cent would increase to 90 per cent in the next 20 years. So, there is a growth factor in the industry; more and more people will be using this form of disposal, if we can call it that.

The other point that I wish to make is that by removing this clause we remove any chance at all of controlling the cost of these services. As the previous speaker said, we cannot do much about it in this vote. However, I would just like to register my thoughts and I would like the Minister to know that—

**An honourable member:** Ask him if he wants to be cremated.

**Mr PETERSON:** That is a question that one could ask him, of course. When we get into Committee we can always say to the Minister, 'Do you want to be cremated?' That is all I wish to say. Any move to remove price control on this function, if we can call it that, is a retrograde step. I think we should have Government control of all costs related to burials, funerals, and this type of thing, and perhaps one day we may see it in this State.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

#### STATE TRANSPORT AUTHORITY ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

#### CORONERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

*[Sitting suspended from 5.27 to 6 p.m.]*

#### HISTORIC SHIPWRECKS BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

#### ESSENTIAL SERVICES BILL

*Later:*

A message was received from the Legislative Council agreeing to a conference to be held in the House of Assembly conference room at 10 a.m. on Thursday 12 November.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier):** I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the conference with the Legislative Council to be held during the adjournment of the House and the managers to report the result thereof forthwith at the next sitting of the House.

Motion carried.

#### ADJOURNMENT

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier):** I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

**Mr LEWIS (Mallee):** In response to the remarks of encouragement that I have just heard, I intend to pursue a question that will take me more than one opportunity to debate to the fullest degree. It is a question of great importance to a significant community within my electorate. The community to which I refer, in the vicinity of Meningie, has difficulties. We need to bring down the curtain and obtain a satisfactory conclusion to a sorry saga and a running sore, largely caused by one man's self-righteous ambition and awful duplicity. This man has given misleading advice to a community either as a result of his own ignorance of the truth and the law or as a result of his own determination to gain control of very valuable real estate and control of a large number of people's lives, or else it is a combination of both those motives. Either way, he likes to exercise this power and seeks to discredit and destroy anyone or anything that threatens this position. Certainly, he has always succeeded in getting a platform to publicly abuse anyone who sought the truth and sought to serve the best interests of this community. He has continued to attack them until they are silenced either by fear or are removed from influence in that situation. He has succeeded in seducing, or, if one likes, conning certain A.L.P. members in the same way, notably Senator McLaren.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** Seducing them?

**Mr LEWIS:** In intellectual terms that is just about what one would call it, although I must say that Senator McLaren was obviously willing in the belief that he could make political mileage of it, which I think was regrettable and unfortunate. I say that as much in defence for myself, because this man now sees me (for what reason I do not know) as a threat to his position.

**Mr Lynn Arnold:** That does not seem unreasonable.

**Mr LEWIS:** That position is held by him in a *de facto* way, unreasonably and unrealistically, and certainly unprofessionally. His attacks have been on people who have professional standing, integrity and qualifications in areas in which they have purported help, at the Government's behest, as well as at the community's behest, for solving the problems that they have.

**Mr McRae:** Who are you talking about, for Heaven's sake?

**Mr LEWIS:** I refer to Mr Ian Hallock and to the mess that he has made of the Point McLeay community, its prosperity, and the agricultural company proprietary limited that they set up years ago to run their farming business. They called that company Ralkon. That word has considerable significance to the people of Point McLeay, in that it is the name that they gave to the locality, geographically,

prior to there ever being any thought of European settlement on this continent. Ralkon, referring to the location, also regrettably means the company, and this man uses the term in an interchangeable fashion, so that no-one quite knows whether he is referring to the proprietary company limited, or to the location, Ralkon. We would know it as Narrung/Point McLeay. However, he never refers to that location by its name if he wants to obscure the real meaning and application of the opinion that he is expressing.

Before I deal with the detail of the matter, for the benefit of members, I should say something about the nature of a proprietary company limited, so that members can understand how this has an important bearing on the remarks that I need to make about this unfortunate saga. A proprietary company limited must have at least two shareholders. It can be a wholly owned subsidiary of another organisation, whether it is an incorporated body or not. It is also possible that the shareholding may be that of two or more natural persons; or it can be any combination of those things. That is to say, a proprietary company limited can be in part owned by another company, whether public or private, or owned in part (or wholly) by a partnership or owned in part (or wholly) by shareholders who are natural persons.

In this case, the agricultural company proprietary limited, called Ralkon Agricultural Co. Pty. Ltd., was set up as the wholly owned subsidiary of the Point McLeay Community Council. Unfortunately, the people in that community have been misled by Mr Hallock into believing that they own it as natural persons, and he has convinced them of that view. Originally two of them held one share each in trust for the entire community. As trustees, on their death, they would have been replaced by other elected trustees to that position. They were then misled into thinking that only two people would benefit from the enormous assets which would be commanded, managed and controlled together with the profits that came from those assets of the company.

That was the first mischief and that is where the problem began. Since then, many people believe that an illegal meeting was called about five years ago at which the trustees were, in effect, dismissed as such, and a wider number of people as natural persons, originally descendants of the Point McLeay community, were given the shareholdings. No provision was ever made for who would succeed to those shares, or what would happen to them. In European law they became shares held by those people, for them to dispose of as they saw fit, and as part of their estate on their deaths they would then be apportioned to their successors according to will or according to law, whether they died intestate or not.

The company has them illegally, but presently still held, and the shareholders of that company do not embrace the totality of the people resident at Point McLeay. Nor do they embrace only people resident at Point McLeay. There are people who are shareholders of that company who do not live on Point McLeay and who are not residents of the land known as Ralkon. They may be resident on lands which are being managed by the company, Ralkon Agricultural Company Pty Ltd, but that is not, in the definition of the original European sense of the law, the community.

There are some 50 or more community councils of this kind throughout Australia where proprietary companies have been set up to conduct the commercial operations of those communities in the best interests of all members of those communities, living and as yet unborn, but in this case we see that purpose subverted by this act of giving natural persons the shares in the company and removing the role of the trustee and taking away the relationship

between the community council and that proprietary company limited.

Therein began the tale, as I have said, and that is unfortunate. Mr Hallock came to be resident at that community after being appointed several years ago to the staff of a company of agricultural consultants called A.A.C.M. As time goes by I will detail that history for the record so that it can be clearly understood. When A.A.C.M. discovered Mr Hallock's incompetence to do the job for which he was appointed, and discovered his incompetence in communicating with members of its staff in accepting advice about the best way to manage that farm, he was dismissed, but he refused to accept that dismissal and sought to overturn the role of that company, A.A.C.M.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The honourable member for Salisbury.

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury):** Tonight I wish to address the House about housing for teachers in country areas, this being a subject that I have had a number of approaches about from teachers in various communities in South Australia concerning not only the recent activities of the Teacher Housing Authority and the Government in general, but also concerning certain promises that were made by the present Government prior to the last election.

Before coming to some of the complaints I have received from people, I draw the attention of the House to comments made in previous years relating to the establishment of the Teacher Housing Authority in April 1975. As a result of a consultant study, or partly as a result of that study, which was commissioned in 1973 by the Education Department and the Institute of Teachers and which reported in March 1974, recommendations were made on the question of incentives for country teaching. One of the comments that was made in that report was as follows:

There was universal agreement that difficulties of housing are the single most important disadvantage of country teaching.

A further reference was made on the same page to the inflated rents on houses which were, in fact, owned by the Education Department. As one of the recommendations consequent upon that statement, the following was written:

... a continuing concerted effort to upgrade accommodation, improve maintenance of department houses and provide more effective assistance in finding boarding accommodation ... This is the most urgent single problem.

As a result of that consultant's report the Teacher Housing Authority was established in 1975 and, as reported in a document from the Education Department on 2 June 1975, the main function of the authority was to provide suitable housing accommodation for single and married teachers. The authority then set about taking over housing assets that previously were controlled by the Education Department and by various other authorities.

It also set about providing the housing needs of country teachers and, indeed, regarded part of its role as being an incentive in the country teaching programme. All apparently was not well as at the last election, because the present Government found that it could make some political capital by making promises about what it would do. It promised, among other things, to reduce Teacher Housing Authority rents. It gave that commitment to the electorate of this State or, more pertinently, to the teachers in country areas of this State. Politics certainly teaches the lesson that you, at your own peril, make promises that you do not fulfil, because now teachers are starting to write in increasing numbers to the Minister. I know this because they send me copies of the letters that they write to him about this very issue. I would like to quote from a couple of those letters. One is from a teacher resident in a Teacher Housing Authority house some distance from Port Lincoln. I imagine



that the member for Flinders received a similar letter. He says, among other things:

... a house similar to the one I now occupy could be rented for about \$50-\$60 per week in Port Lincoln. When I mentioned the rental rate I am now due to pay at—

and he mentions the township he is at—

I was met with a response that left me with no doubt that they thought \$84 per fortnight was an excessive rate.

That was the amount he was paying there. He also made the following comment in his letter:

In 1976 the rental on this house was \$28.16 per fortnight. The proposed new rate is \$84 per fortnight, an increase of 300 per cent in five years.

Then he raised an interesting point which I think ought to be taken into account when considering the level at which rents for Teacher Housing Authority houses are determined, because they should partly be to take account of the higher cost of keeping one's house in the city, perhaps not made up by rents that one is achieving on those houses while a teacher is serving country teaching duty. He stated the following:

When I moved to the country to take up a promotion position I was paying for a house at the rate of \$30 per fortnight. With increases in interest rates that payment is now in the region of \$50 per fortnight. A quick conservative calculation of my losses over the period 1979-81 shows that my loss is in the region of \$1 200 in higher rental rates, over repayments, plus at the end of the rental period I have not paid off one cent of interest or capital. This makes a total loss in the area of \$5 200 over three years. Another disincentive to serve in country areas!

An important point is that we are not dealing just with the immediate impact or the particular impact of the rents charged for country housing, but also the total housing financial problem that faces teachers who are doing country service. That is by no manner of means the only letter, as I have letters from other areas. I can quote from the teachers at one of the high schools at Port Augusta, who wrote to me only the other day, as follows:

We wish to make a strong protest against the increases in rental of Teacher Housing Authority accommodation. These increases are unjustified and unfair for many reasons; some of these are listed below:

Teachers were previously promised by the present Government a 25 per cent reduction in their rental charges.

That is an interesting point, because that promise was not lived up to. The letter continues:

Many teachers find their housing unsatisfactory for various reasons.

Then the letter lists the large number of reasons why some of the houses are unsatisfactory. It then continues:

Many T.H.A. houses and flats are in a very depressing and poor state of repair.

Teachers do not have the right to sole occupancy. This means they often have to share with strangers, and often several different people in one year. These people do not even have the right to accept full rental and assure themselves of some privacy and personal freedom and sanity.

That should be a contingency factor when determining the extent to which economic market rentals should be used as part of the base formula, but it appears not to be the case. The letter goes on in great detail in that whole area.

When teachers write to the Teacher Housing Authority or their local committees complaining about increases in rental they receive the sorts of response that one teacher received, as follows:

In keeping with Government policy, rents have been assessed on the basis of four-fifths of the vacancy rent level charged by the South Australian Housing Trust for a comparable standard of housing. This means that certain concessions previously granted in the rental component no longer apply.

They have presented me with figures indicating that houses they are renting in certain areas are in excess of four-fifths of vacancy rent of equivalent Housing Trust houses. In any event, part of the proposals of the P.A. Consultants report

and the document I quoted from of 2 June 1975 indicated that certain of those concessions referred to were important elements in the provision of the housing, and that they were essential elements in the provision of that housing in many parts of the State. However, we are now told that they are not to be taken into account as being part of the incentive programme and that they now must be regarded as an asset in the house that has rental attached to it on economic grounds.

One could go through many of the documents relating to the Teacher Housing Authority and look at the way in which it assesses its rents. The comment I have just made is not correct because it is not the authority itself which assesses the rents; the rents are assessed for it, and the authority is merely the management authority of those houses. One of the things that concerned me greatly was the charge levied when people rent furniture in Teacher Housing Authority houses.

It works out at \$14 per week for two people living in a T.H.A. house. That is quite an excessive amount. If one added that up over three years of service, one could well suppose that they could have bought the furniture much more cheaply than paying those rentals. That does not seem to be evidence of the T.H.A. providing an incentive in that regard. My time is short, but I will be pursuing this matter on other occasions through the adjournment debate and Questions on Notice. One of the points I wish to put to the Minister, who is now in the Chamber, is when can we expect the report on Government employee housing to be tabled in this House so that we can know what the full assessment of all Government employee housing is in this State and so that we can determine whether or not the Teacher Housing Authority is—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The honourable member for Glenelg.

**Mr MATHWIN (Glenelg):** Although I wish to discuss matters involving the Minister of Transport, I would first indicate to the member for Salisbury, who has been talking about broken promises of this Government, that if he waits he will hear about some broken promises of the previous Government. First, let me say how fortunate we are to have a Minister of Transport of such calibre in this Government, a man who has his feet on the ground and knows what the State needs, and who does not fly off at a tangent without giving full consideration to any ideas put before him. He is not like his predecessor, who was full of many weird ideas. I think that the previous Minister, the Hon. Geoffrey Virgo, came into this House at times with antics and statements forced upon him by decisions of Caucus. We know the effect of Caucus on the Labor Party, and at times he appeared to make statements to this House in a rather coy manner. Let me remind the member for Salisbury of what the previous Minister was reported in the *Advertiser* of 2 June 1973 as saying:

Part of the Government's plan to make rail travel more appealing to commuters would include the electrification of some cars. It was hoped that the Christie Downs extension would be electrified by 1975.

The Minister went on to say:

Double decker trains could be operating on the Adelaide-Christie Downs railway line by July 1975.

This was in 1973. The member for Salisbury would immediately come to my aid here and prompt me to say that that was a broken promise, a promise made and broken, of course, by his Government. The Minister then went on to refer to a '\$22 700 000 project to electrify the entire Adelaide to Christie Downs railway service'. In July 1973 the same Minister, Mr Virgo, said:

High-speed, electric double-decker trains could be servicing the new Adelaide to Christie Downs railway line by mid-1975.

This would be 'part of a \$22 700 000 project to upgrade the service'. Of course, that was very close to an election date. Although I am not one to think of things like this, maybe it was a little bit of cheese for the mouse. Mr Virgo said that the trains would be capable of 70 m.p.h. and 'might be air-conditioned'. Of course, we put in trains that are air-conditioned. He went on to refer to their 'fast acceleration and braking', adding that they would reduce the Christie Downs trip to Adelaide to 40 minutes—'faster and safer than people could expect to travel by road'. Mr Virgo said that there would be a gradual transition from diesel to electric cars by 1986. The *Sunday Mail* of 9 September 1973 reported:

'Almost certain' electrification of the Adelaide—Elizabeth rail line.

This would delight the member for Salisbury whose electorate is in that area. Mr Virgo was quoted as saying that this would follow electrification of the Adelaide-Christie Downs line. So, he promised the Christie Downs line would be electrified, and then he was going straight on and extending it to the honourable member's territory of Salisbury and Elizabeth. In the *Advertiser* of 11 March 1974, we see:

Electrification of Adelaide's metropolitan rail system at a cost of about \$15 000 000 could be completed within seven years. Work on the three metropolitan lines—

we have gone further, because we have now got three—

Port Adelaide, Gawler and the Adelaide Hills—would begin soon after the \$15 000 000 electric railway between Adelaide and Christie Downs was completed.

**Mr Becker:** What happened to all the gear he bought?

**Mr MATHWIN:** That rusted on the side of the line in some areas. I think it was disposed of to some salvage company or other. The *Advertiser* of 2 July 1975, referring to a former Premier, the Hon. Don Dunstan, complete with his pink shorts and with his foot up on the front seat (I can see him now), reported:

The development of Adelaide's urban transport system over the next five years is expected to cost the State Government about \$130 000 000.

Mr Dunstan was quoted as follows:

The capital costs for development of the system would be about \$26 000 000 a year. It was hoped to have the first diesel train on the Christie Downs line late this year—

that is, in 1975—

and to have the first electric train running in 1977.

The *Advertiser* of 5 October 1973 reported:

Adelaide's five-year transport plan would be followed to the letter, the Minister of Transport (Mr Virgo) said yesterday. The five-year plan included extensions to the Christie Downs railway, a two-mile branch line to West Lakes, electrification of the entire urban rail system, improvements to the Glenelg tram service—

There is something; we have a tram that operates on square wheels and has been doing so for the last 25 years. The report refers also to a rapid transit line to Modbury costing \$56 600 000, new rail link with Modbury costing \$88 500 000, rail or rapid transit extensions to Aldinga costing another \$20 000 000, and a possible international airport at Monarto, according to Mr Virgo. Here we are many years afterwards still witnessing these broken promises. Then in June 1977 we read about another promise by Mr Virgo, as follows:

Cactus as a possible fuel source . . . one of the most exotic schemes that could be considered is 'personalised rapid transit'. This enables a traveller to dial a destination and be automatically transported at up to 48 kilometres an hour in miniature cars over an electric rail network. The really big question [he says] is, can people take it? We can produce the system, but when people are being whizzed over complicated interconnected intercrossing tracks at 48 kilometres an hour without personal control, will the human psyche take it?

The member for Salisbury has been telling us about some broken promises of a Government in office over the last two years, and here we have his great friend and no doubt adviser, Mr Virgo, who still has his finger in the pie, I understand from my informants, making all these promises. Then we read:

Moves to introduce a 300 m.p.h. hovertrain transport system to South Australia were initiated in London this week by the Minister of Roads and Transport (Mr Virgo).

That was on 27 May 1971.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Motion carried.

At 6.34 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 11 November at 2 p.m.

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 10 November 1981

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

## TRANSPORT CONCESSIONS

144. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Has the Government received any approaches from the War Widows Guild or from individuals requesting that the present transport concession arrangements be extended to cover war widows and, if so, what has been the response to those inquiries?

2. In which States does this concession already apply and what justification, if any, is there for its non-application in this State?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. Yes. The War Widow's Guild has been advised as follows:

At 60 years of age, the combined war widow's pension and reduced age pension provides a total income beyond the criteria for fringe benefits. To give all war widows a State concession card must be weighed against the considerable number of retired people in a similar financial position whose income is a little beyond the limit and so are not eligible for fringe benefits.

When resources are limited it is desirable to provide help to those who are most in need, thus the need for a means test.

2. (a) Travel concessions are available to war widows in Perth, Canberra and Melbourne. They do not receive any concessions in Sydney, Hobart, Adelaide or on Australian National. Concessions were allowed in Brisbane until 1976, but from that date they became ineligible although those receiving benefits at that time were allowed to retain them.

(b) Refer to 1.

## INGLE FARM CENTRAL PRIMARY SCHOOL

154. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Regarding flooding at the Ingle Farm Central Primary School, did the Minister state the problem was the result of the past winter being exceptionally wet and, if so, is the Minister aware of similar complaints about flooding being made on 5 February 1980 in a letter to the Central Northern Region Office and in 1980 by a letter from the member for Florey to the Minister and did these letters and other approaches received by the Minister or the department indicate that flooding has been a problem at that school during other winters?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The flooding at Ingle Farm Central Primary School is a result of the existing drainage problem. This has existed for a number of years and has certainly been exacerbated by the exceptionally wet winter this year. I am aware that the school in a letter dated 15 February 1980, requested assistance from the Director of Educational Facilities to overcome this problem. The Site Development Office of the Public Buildings Department has recommended a staged redevelopment of the area which would overcome the school's concern.

I have already written to the school council and the member for Florey indicating that stage I will be completed this financial year. Funds for this have now been approved and I trust that stage I will be completed before the onset of next winter.

## DROWNINGS

171. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. How many drownings have occurred in South Australia during the year 1980-81 in the sea, rivers, ponds and dams, backyard pools, less than 6" of water, bathrooms or children's baths at home, or through boating at sea, boating in rivers, being washed off rocks, scuba diving, misadventure or suicide, respectively?

2. What public awareness programmes currently exist or are to be mounted in an effort to reduce these fatalities and what are the respective costs involved?

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** The replies are as follows:

1. Drownings in South Australia, 1 July 1980 to 30 June 1981.

Home pool .....	Nil
Community pool .....	1
Bath .....	1
Fishponds/dam/tanks etc. ....	2
Swimming in sea .....	3
Swimming in rivers/lakes/creeks .....	1
Boating in sea .....	5
Boating in rivers .....	2
Skin/scuba diving .....	Nil
Washed off rocks .....	Nil
Submerged cars .....	Nil
Misadventure .....	1
Suicide .....	4

2. The National Safety Council of Australia through the Water Safety Committee has over the past 10 years concentrated their efforts on educating children from 7-16 years. This has been achieved by co-ordinating the resources of all safety groups in this State, in particular the resources of the Education Department.

The production of animated television commercials, posters and more recently a book (to be launched next month) has been undertaken. The Water Safety Committee believes that the excellent results in the reduction of drownings over the past 10 years indicated that their philosophies have been correct, and accordingly have no intention of changing their emphasis away from children.

## NOISE CONTROL

198. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to meet the request of the Police Department for additional power to control noise emanating from late night parties and, if so, what form of action does the Government intend to introduce and when?

2. How many complaints have the Police Department received concerning noise emanating from late night parties?

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** The replies are as follows:

1. Recommendations of the Report of the Working Party on Noise associated with the Operation of Entertainment Premises Licensed and Otherwise are still being considered by the Government.

2. The Police Department does not maintain records of all complaints received in respect of noise emanating from late night parties.

## SHANDON HOTEL

204. **Mr MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment and Planning: Why doesn't the Government

take some action to stop the excessive noise in the late evening and early morning emanating from the Shandon Hotel; why hasn't it taken any action already and will it now take action and, if so, what action?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** It is incorrect to suggest that no action has been taken by the Government regarding the noise problem associated with the stage door room of the Shandon Hotel/Motel. The Department of Environment and Planning views this matter very seriously and the hotel management has been informed that a permanent solution must be effected in the immediate future in relation to noise emanating from the hotel.

Measures taken to date by the management include installation of a four and one half (4½) inch insulation blanket to the whole ceiling of the stage door room, and a new inner skin to the four walls of the building with four (4) inches of cavity insulation. These modifications have been insufficient to provide full noise control, and the Department of Environment and Planning has been advised that a noise control monitor currently on order is to be installed in conjunction with further insulation work. Additionally, the management has advised that if these alterations do not succeed then there are plans to implement a further stage of noise suppression involving a double partition inside the existing eastern and northern walls.

#### PASSENGER INFORMATION DISPLAYS

205. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. When is it intended to introduce passenger information displays or announcements at unmanned railway stations?

2. What types of systems are being investigated by the S.T.A. for possible introduction?

3. On what lines and stations is it intended to first introduce such information systems?

4. Is it a fact that interchange station displays are to be improved and, if so, how and what localities will be involved?

5. Is it intended to upgrade the present information centre on the concourse at the Adelaide Railway Station and, if so, when, what types of systems are being investigated for possible use and what reductions in station staff will occur?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The State Transport Authority has engaged a firm of consultants to study and report on all aspects of upgrading the Metropolitan Rail Signalling and Communications System.

This study includes:

- Passenger information systems at all metropolitan stations, including unmanned stations and interchange stations.
- Public address for emergency and special announcements.

No decisions can be made on the implementation of any upgrading or type of system until the study is completed and the final report reviewed.

#### POLICE RETIREMENTS

207. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: How many police officers have retired in the 1979-80 and 1980-81 years due to ill health and job stress, respectively?

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** The replies are as follows:

1979-80, 17.

1980-81, 19.

#### EDMUND WRIGHT HOUSE

210. **Mr MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. Why was access to Edmund Wright House not available to handicapped persons on Friday 16 October?

2. Is it normally available to such persons and, if so, what are the arrangements under which it is so available and, if not, why not?

3. What has the Government done since Friday 16 October to ensure that such access is available during the same hours as it is available to other people and when was such action taken?

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** The replies are as follows:

1. Access to Edmund Wright House was available to handicapped persons on Friday 16 October.

2. This building is normally available for access by disabled people. Depending on the degree of disability, or aids used, some handicapped persons do require assistance to gain access.

3. The building is available for access by handicapped people during the same hours as it is available to the general public.

An inspection was carried out on Thursday 22 October, and two alternative proposals which would allow easier and more dignified access for wheelchair users and severely disabled ambulant persons are now being considered.

#### HOUSING TRUST UNITS

212. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment and Planning representing the Minister of Housing:

1. What type and how many Housing Trust units will be erected adjacent to the Bower cottages at Semaphore Park and what is the cost of this project?

2. How many families will be accommodated in these units and how many pensioner units will be provided?

3. What is the completion date of this project?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The replies are as follows:

1. The South Australian Housing Trust has an intensive construction programme in the immediate vicinity to the Bower cottages, Bower Road. At present 77 houses, at a cost of approximately \$3 250 000, are under construction. These are expected to be completed by mid-1982. A further 62 houses are expected to be commenced in the first half of 1982 and completed early in 1983. It would be inappropriate to give the trust's cost estimate prior to the calling of tenders.

2. All of these houses will accommodate families.

3. During 1982 the trust will also commence a development of cottage flats for aged pensioners and attached family housing on a site extending from the corner of Bower and Causeway Roads, which is opposite the Bower cottages. Planning for the site has only just commenced and the number of houses proposed is not yet available, but the units are expected to be occupied in 1983.

#### NORTH-SOUTH ARTERIAL ROAD

213. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Does the Government support the proposal for an arterial road linking Adelaide's northern and southern suburbs as described on page 5 of the *News* of 13 October 1981 and, if not, why not and, if so, why, what is the estimated cost of the proposal and what discussions have been held with the mayors or councils concerned?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** Following a deputation from the Corporation of Thebarton, which waited upon me to

discuss the north-south transportation corridor, I asked the Commissioner of Highways to arrange for his officers to meet with Mayor Keough and the Town Clerk of Thebarton to discuss the proposal and council's suggestion that the former North Terrace-Glenelg railway reserve be used to link Port Road with Morphett or Brighton Roads. This meeting was held on 15 September 1981.

Highways Department officers will consider the advantages and disadvantages of the two schemes. I expect the Commissioner of Highways to be in a position to provide me with a report early next year.

### FREE PUBLIC TRANSPORT

214. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport—Does the Government intend to introduce a free public transport system on a trial basis, similar to that introduced in Victoria and, if not, why not and, if so, when and what bus, tram and train services will be involved?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The South Australian Government provides free public transport five days a week on metropolitan services for pensioners and unemployed persons during off-peak hours. The Government does not propose to extend further free travel concessions at this time.

### SURPLUS BUSES

215. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. How many S.T.A. surplus buses were sold during the year 1980-81 and how much was received from such sales?

2. What is the basis for determining that a bus should be sold (that is, mileage, age, condition, etc.)?

3. What surplus buses are currently available for sale and at what respective localities?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. 38—\$173 975.

2. The primary consideration is the age of the vehicle. However, general condition and kilometres travelled are also taken into account in making the final decision.

3. Seventy-one buses are available for sale at present. Seven are stored at C.M.V. Used Trucks Pty Ltd, Regency Park, 48 are stored at the Electricity Trust depot, Angle Park, and 16 are stored at the authority's Regency Park workshop. Tenders will be invited in the near future for the disposal of these buses.

### ALCO TEST BAGS

216. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What is the cost of an alco test 'puff bag' and how many have been purchased?

2. Are these alco test bags manufactured in South Australia and, if so, by whom and, if not, who are the manufacturers?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. \$1.19—90 710.

2. No. Manufacturers are Dragerwerk in Lubek, Germany.

### RAILWAY ACCIDENT

217. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What were the factors that led to the collision between an S.T.A. Supertrain and an A.N.R. freight wagon at Dry Creek on the evening of 19 October 1981?

2. What was the cost of damage to the Supertrain and to the A.N.R. vehicles, respectively?

3. What was the cost of track repairs and the overtime worked?

4. How many S.T.A. passengers were injured and what were the major injuries?

5. What malfunction, if any, of signalling equipment was involved?

6. How many passenger services were delayed as a result of this accident on 19 and 20 October, respectively, and when were normal services resumed?

7. How many S.T.A. buses were used to ferry passengers and what was the cost involved?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. Human error.

2. Still being assessed.

3. Approximately \$7 500.

4. Eight passengers received slight injuries.

5. None.

6. Delays to services were: Monday, 19.10.81—2 trains delayed, 10 trains cancelled; Tuesday, 20.10.81—36 trains delayed, 22 cancelled. Normal services resumed at 11.50 a.m. on Tuesday, 20.10.81.

7. Fifteen buses were utilised during the disruption. No additional staff were required as all buses and operators used were on standby. Minimal out-of-pocket expenses were incurred.

### SALMONELLA

221. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: What were the causes of 16 cases of salmonella poisoning in Port Pirie, how many families were affected and what were the results of the I.M.V.S. tests on food collected?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** Tests revealed that the causative organism in all cases was *Salmonella typhimurium* phage type 101. Eleven households have been affected. Numerous food items have been collected and analysed at the Food Hygiene Laboratory of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science.

### ACCIDENTAL SPRAYING

222. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. What did the investigation into the alleged accidental spraying of D.D.T. on several houses at Gawler on the weekend of 16-17 October reveal?

2. How many houses were accidentally sprayed and how many families were checked for ill effects?

3. What follow up checks does the Health Commission intend to carry out on these families?

4. How many water tanks were polluted?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. The investigation revealed that on Saturday, 17 October 1981, approximately 250 acres of lupins located in a rural area to the north-east of Gawler were sprayed with a chemical containing 20 per cent D.D.T. The chemical was applied at a rate of 3 pints per acre.

2. The flight path followed by the aircraft applying the chemical may have resulted in the accidental spraying of two houses. The occupants of the houses have not been tested for the presence of D.D.T. in their bodies. Most people living in countries like Australia, where D.D.T. has been used extensively for agricultural purposes, have deposits of D.D.T. in their body fats. Consequently, the detection

of D.D.T. in the body tissues of the occupants of these houses could not reasonably be attributed only to this particular incident. Nevertheless, people living in the area have been advised to consult their doctor should they be concerned about this matter.

3. None. No clinical effects would be detectable due to the low level of exposure experienced.

4. The S.A. Health Commission is not aware of any water tanks being polluted as a consequence of this incident. Samples of water taken from three tanks in the area where the spraying occurred contained 0.2 micrograms per litre or less of D.D.T. The roof of one house was flushed with water, the run-off collected and two samples analysed. Both contained 1 ug/l of D.D.T. All test results were well within the maximum residue limit of 3 ug/l recommended by the National Health and Medical Research Council.

#### Mr G. JOSELIN

223. **Mr SLATER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism:

1. What are the terms and conditions of the agreement in regard to the consultancy of the former Director of Tourism, Mr G. Joselin, in the United Kingdom?

2. What duties will Mr Joselin be required to perform on behalf of the Government?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. Mr Joselin has been engaged by the Government to act as a consultant to it in the United Kingdom and Europe for a period of four years from 1 January 1982. The emoluments payable to him are as follows:

(a) *Retainer*

\$20 000 per annum for 4 years from 1 January 1982.

(b) *Telephone Calls*

All telephone calls made by Mr Joselin in the course of his consultancy, where the distance of the call exceeds 25 miles, will be reimbursed.

(c) *Telex*

Mr Joselin will be reimbursed for the use of any telex or other long distance communicating system.

(d) *Travel and Accommodation*

Mr Joselin will be paid the cost of authorised travel, accommodation and other subsistence within the United Kingdom and Europe when the travel, accommodation and subsistence is incurred in connection with his consultancy. He will not be reimbursed the cost of travel between his home and London, nor any travel within a radius of 5 miles of the London office of the Agent General for South Australia in the United Kingdom.

(e) *Entertainment*

Mr Joselin will be reimbursed for entertainment reasonably required to be undertaken by him for the purpose of the consultancy.

In addition, the Government has met the cost of economy air fares and removal of furniture for Mr Joselin and his family to London.

2. Mr Joselin will provide consultancy services to the Government in respect of tourist and related matters of State Development as approved by the Premier from time to time. Without limiting the generality of duties outlined above, Mr Joselin will be available to supply consultancy services relating to:

(a) applications by overseas air carriers for licences to operate direct air services from the United Kingdom and Europe to the City of Adelaide; and

(b) increasing tourist traffic from the United Kingdom and Europe to South Australia.

#### CRASH HELMETS

226. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Are crash helmets made from polycarbonate materials available in South Australia and, if so, how many head injuries have been attributed to flaws in crash helmets made of this material?

2. Is the Minister aware of the concern expressed by some road authorities as to the dangers inherent in using crash helmets made of such material and, if so, what actions has the Government taken to ban their sale?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. Motorcycle safety helmets made from polycarbonate materials are available in South Australia. There are no accident statistics available regarding the number of head injuries which could be attributed to the failure of safety helmets.

2. The Government is aware that the use of polycarbonate for the construction of motorcycle safety helmets has been questioned. The Australian Standards Association Committee A.U.12 has indicated that further investigations will be undertaken into the suitability of polycarbonate for safety helmets. The question of banning this type of safety helmet will be considered following the completion of these investigations.

#### SATURDAY AFTERNOON SHOPPING

227. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs: Does the Government intend to introduce Saturday afternoon shopping on a trial basis and, if so, when and for how long?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** No.

#### ROAD ACCIDENTS

231. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. How many road accidents in South Australia in 1980-81 were solely or partially attributed to sub-standard designed roads or rough riding surfaces, respectively?

2. What on-going research is conducted in relation to these causes of accidents?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. The detail sought by the honourable member is not available. There are three factors involved in road accidents: vehicle, driver, and the road environment. In all situations these factors are interactive and any one or all of them would be a contributing factor, to a greater or lesser degree, depending on the circumstances.

2. Many bodies, including the Highways Department, carry out research appropriate to road safety matters.

#### RIVERLAND BRIDGE

234. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: What are the names of the four locations under consideration for the building of a new bridge in the Riverland and what are the estimated costs for the building of each?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The Highways Department is proceeding with its investigations into the proposed construction of a bridge over the River Murray at the following locations: Berri Far West; Berri West; Berri East; and Lyrup. As the investigation is not yet complete, no indication can be given as to the costs involved at the aforementioned locations at this time.